1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
2	DISTRICT OF PUERTO RICO			
3	In Re:) Docket No. 3:17-BK-3283(LTS)			
4)) Title III			
5	The Financial Oversight and) Management Board for)			
6	Puerto Rico,) (Jointly Administered)			
7	as representative of)			
8	The Commonwealth of) Puerto Rico, et al.,) October 30, 2019			
9				
10	and)) Puerto Rico Electric)			
11	Power Authority,)			
12	Debtors.)			
13				
14	OMNIBUS HEARING			
14 15	OMNIBUS HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE LAURA TAYLOR SWAIN			
15	BEFORE THE HONORABLE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE LAURA TAYLOR SWAIN			
15 16	BEFORE THE HONORABLE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE LAURA TAYLOR SWAIN UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE			
15 16 17	BEFORE THE HONORABLE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE LAURA TAYLOR SWAIN UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE APPEARANCES:			
15 16 17 18	BEFORE THE HONORABLE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE LAURA TAYLOR SWAIN UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE APPEARANCES: For The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, et al.: Mr. Martin J. Bienenstock, PHV			
15 16 17 18 19	BEFORE THE HONORABLE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE LAURA TAYLOR SWAIN UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE APPEARANCES: For The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, et al.: Mr. Martin J. Bienenstock, PHV Ms. Laura Stafford, PHV Mr. Brian S. Rosen, PHV			
15 16 17 18 19 20	BEFORE THE HONORABLE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE LAURA TAYLOR SWAIN UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE APPEARANCES: For The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, et al.: Mr. Martin J. Bienenstock, PHV Ms. Laura Stafford, PHV Mr. Brian S. Rosen, PHV Appearing in New York			
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	BEFORE THE HONORABLE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE LAURA TAYLOR SWAIN UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE APPEARANCES: For The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, et al.: Mr. Martin J. Bienenstock, PHV Ms. Laura Stafford, PHV Mr. Brian S. Rosen, PHV			
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	BEFORE THE HONORABLE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE LAURA TAYLOR SWAIN UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE APPEARANCES: For The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, et al.: Mr. Martin J. Bienenstock, PHV Ms. Laura Stafford, PHV Mr. Brian S. Rosen, PHV Appearing in New York For the U.S. Trustee			
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	BEFORE THE HONORABLE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE LAURA TAYLOR SWAIN UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE APPEARANCES: For The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, et al.: Mr. Martin J. Bienenstock, PHV Ms. Laura Stafford, PHV Mr. Brian S. Rosen, PHV Appearing in New York For the U.S. Trustee			

1	APPEARANCES (Continued):		
2	D-11 - 11 - 066' ' 1		
3	For the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors:	Mr.	Luc A. Despins, PHV
4	For the Puerto Rico		_
5	Fiscal Agency and		
6	Financial Advisory Authority:	Mr.	Peter Friedman, PHV
7			Appearing in New York
8	For the Asociacion de Maestros de		
9	Puerto Rico:	Mr.	Jose L. Barrios Ramos, Esq.
10	For the Bankruptcy Estate of Romualdo		
11	Rivera Andrini,	Мс	Noreen Wiscovitch Rentas, Esq.
12	Chapter / Trustee.	MS.	Noteen wiscovitch Kentas, Esq.
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24	Drogoodings recorded by	a+ ^ > -	ography Transcript produced be-
25	Proceedings recorded by CAT.	steno	ography. Transcript produced by
ı	I		

1		I N D E X
2	WITNESSES:	PAGE
3	None offered.	
4		
5	EXHIBITS:	
6	None offered.	
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

San Juan, Puerto Rico

October 30, 2019

At or about 9:30 AM

THE COURT: Again, good morning and welcome to counsel, parties in interest, and members of the public and press here in San Juan, those observing here and in New York, and the telephonic participants. As always, it is good to be

9 | back here.

I remind you that consistent with court and judicial conference policies, and the Orders that have been issued, there is to be no use of any electronic devices in the courtroom to communicate with any person, source, or outside repository of information, nor to record any part of the proceedings. Thus, all electronic devices must be turned off unless you are using a particular device to take notes or to refer to notes or documents already loaded on the device. All audible signals, including vibration features, must be turned off.

No recording or retransmission of the hearing is permitted by any person, including but not limited to the parties or the press. Anyone who is observed or otherwise found to have been texting, e-mailing or otherwise communicating with a device from a courtroom during the court proceeding will be subject to sanctions, including but not

limited to confiscation of the device and denial of future requests to bring devices into the courtroom. And again, a warm welcome and good morning to everyone.

So our timing today is 9:30 to 12:00, and from 1:00 to 5:00, if necessary. And Agenda Item IV.4 will be taken up at 10:30 this morning, if the individual who's filed papers in that matter wishes to be heard.

We'll begin with the report of the Oversight Board.

MR. BIENENSTOCK: Good morning, Judge Swain.

THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Bienenstock.

MR. BIENENSTOCK: Martin Bienenstock from Proskauer Rose for the Oversight Board.

Your Honor, in respect of the first topic, the general status and activities of the Oversight Board, since the September hearing, the Oversight Board's primary activities have included the following: The Joint Plan and Disclosure Statement. On September 27th, the Oversight Board filed the Proposed Plan of Adjustment for the Commonwealth, the Public Buildings Authority, and the Employees Retirement System, and a proposed Disclosure Statement explaining it. The Joint Plan addresses over 35 billion of debt and other claims against these debtors and more than 55 billion of pension liabilities, and brings Puerto Rico closer to emerging from Title III.

In respect of creditor and stakeholder negotiations,

the filed Plan reflects the deals negotiated with three significant stakeholder groups: The Official Committee of Retirees, the Group of Government Employees represented by the Public Service Union, and the Puerto Rico Chapter of AFSCME, and the Lawful Constitutional Debt Coalition, LCDC.

The Oversight Board continues to meet with other individual creditors and creditor groups in and out of mediation in the hopes of building more consensus for the Plan of Adjustment. The Oversight Board also continues its efforts to broaden active public employee support for its proposed plan.

The entire mediation team has been instrumental to achievements in mediation, and the Oversight Board looks forward to continuing those sessions. On October 28, this Court extended the deadline for the mediation team to file its report, and the current Stay Order lasts until December 31, 2019, unless the Court orders otherwise.

In respect of PREPA, the Oversight Board is working with the Commonwealth on the transformation of PREPA to ensure reliable and cost effective energy for the people of Puerto Rico. We agree that private management of PREPA's generation, transmission and distribution systems are key to its transformation, and we continue to collaborate with the Commonwealth to that end.

In respect of the fiscal plans and budgets, the

Oversight Board continues to monitor implementation of the measures called for in the certified fiscal plans, and to meet constantly with AAFAF and other government representatives in respect of those measures. The Oversight Board's executive director, Natalie Jaresko, recently testified on Capitol Hill about the Board's progress, both in terms of providing the components necessary for a sustainable economy in Puerto Rico and the debt restructuring.

In respect of disaster relief, the Oversight Board continues to advocate on Capitol Hill for additional and faster support from the Federal Government, particularly regarding disaster relief funding Puerto Rico desperately needs for its recovery.

Your Honor, in respect of the second topic for the status report, the reformulation of the debtors' ADR proposal, I'm going to provide an overview. And my partner, Brian Rosen, is in the courtroom in New York if there are detailed questions that I can't answer.

Since the Court provided guidance at the July Omnibus hearing, the debtors have worked with the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts to develop a revised proposed ADR procedures motion. We've received some feedback from the Administrative Office, as well as from AAFAF, on the most recent draft of our ADR procedures motion.

At the same time, using the proposed mailing that the

Court had approved at the July Omnibus hearing, we have mailed letters to claimants who did not provide sufficiently detailed information with their claims forms to enable the debtors to process them. Although the response rate to these letters has not been as high as hoped, the Board remains hopeful that the response we are receiving will help us develop a better picture of the number and type of claims that will ultimately need to be resolved through the ADR process.

The debtors are continuing to attempt to reconcile the Court's guidance, and the feedback we're receiving from the Office of U.S. Courts and other parties, and our latest draft of the ADR motion, and the responses we have received to the proposed mailings and intend to propose a revised ADR procedure as soon as practicable.

In respect of PRIDCO's RSA and anticipated Title VI filing, PRIDCO has public bonds in the outstanding amount of approximately 150 million dollars in principal, and 15 million dollars in accrued interest.

As AAFAF notified the Court at the June 13 Omnibus hearing, AAFAF entered into a Restructuring Support Agreement with over two-thirds of the bondholders. While the Oversight Board has not been formally asked to approve the RSA as a qualifying modification, the Board's professionals are working with AAFAF's professionals to understand the mechanics and numbers underlying the RSA. This process is ongoing. Should

the Oversight Board issue a voluntary agreement certification as a result of the PRIDCO RSA, the parties would aim to commence a Title VI case qualifying modification for PRIDCO by year end or first quarter of 2020.

In respect of the general status of relations among the Oversight Board, the Commonwealth, and the Federal Governments, the chairman of the Oversight Board communicates frequently with the Governor, as does the Board's executive director, who is also in constant communication with the Governor's senior advisors. As always, the relations among the professionals for the government and the Oversight Board are excellent.

There is constant constructive communication. As Natalie Jaresko testified to Congress on October 22, 2019, the Oversight Board, the Governor and her team have held dozens of meetings on the Fiscal Plan and budget implementation. We have made great progress working together, despite ongoing differences to some extent.

Since this Court's July Stay Order, the Oversight
Board and AAFAF cooperated to commence PBA's Title III case,
and to continue to cooperate -- and to continue to cooperate
on PRIDCO's anticipated Title VI filing. The Oversight Board
has also been working closely with AAFAF and OMB on other
issues outside the Joint Plan. For instance, the Oversight
Board and AAFAF are working to better understand the needs of

the Departments of Education and Corrections in order to determine how underutilized funds can best be allocated to priority areas, while ensuring their efficient utilization.

In respect of relations with the Federal Government, the Oversight Board laments the slow disbursement of federal disaster aid funding, particularly public assistance funding from the Federal Emergency Management Agency, FEMA, and disaster recoveries, CDBRDR funding from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. This funding is essential to restoring critical infrastructures to Puerto Rico and generating long-term economic recovery, yet both FEMA and HUD have been slow to obligate and disburse funding.

Reconstruction efforts are slow. More than two years since the double tragedies of hurricanes Irma and Maria, very few permanent projects have begun. This result is unusual and does not remotely match the time line for other disasters, such as Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Harvey.

Relief funding has been slowly disbursed. Of the 19.9 billion dollars in funds allocated to Puerto Rico by Congress, only 1.5 billion have been made available, and only a fraction of that amount has been drawn down. Another 8.2 billion still requires HUD's authorization to release, and 10.2 billion requires HUD's publication of notice in the Federal Register.

The Oversight Board has also raised its concern with

Congress that several proposed amendments to PROMESA will undermine pending negotiations and Title III restructuring efforts, as well as the return to economic sustainability of Puerto Rico, although we do not think that was the intent of Congress, and the Oversight Board has expressed its views and reasons.

The Oversight Board has and does support legislative efforts to provide additional federal support to Puerto Rico, including equitable treatment for Puerto Rico in terms of the Medicaid program and the expansion of the Earned Income Tax Credit to families in Puerto Rico.

Your Honor, subject to the Court's questions, that concludes the status report.

THE COURT: Thank you. I do have more questions about the ADR related proposal. And so I gather I should direct those to Mr. Rosen?

MR. BIENENSTOCK: That would be excellent, and I see him approaching the podium in New York.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Bienenstock.

Good morning, Mr. Rosen.

So, Mr. Rosen, as you know, we had been expecting a reformulated proposal to be publicly proposed. I'm aware of interactions that have been had with the Administrative Office, and based on the sorts of features that were seen in the draft to the Administrative Office, I can tell you that

the Administrative Office and the Court have invested time and exploratory efforts in aid of understanding how front end mediation and arbitration procedures that have been employed in connection with other complex matters could possibly be adapted for these cases. And we have been seeking to ready any necessary judicial resources to deal with claims that are either not resolved through a nonjudicial process, or to deal with judicial involvement in such a front end process because, you know, at this point we're not aware of a proposal to bring outside resources to that front end.

So we are at a bit of a timing problem. We've been trying to keep up with you. It seems like we may have gotten ahead of you. And we have some real time and resource allocation issues to deal with, and this appears to be a window of opportunity to focus on these things before the mediators' report comes in, the scheduling proposal comes in, and I understand that I may be off to the races in an unprecedented way after that. So I'm trying to use my time well.

So if you can give me, you know, some more insight into whether you want us to stand down, whether you think the timetable is changing, whether you think there's something that may be helpful in Mr. Mudd's proposal, or looking to another organization like, you know, JAMS or something to propose a structure, I'm anxious to hear about any and all of

that.

MR. ROSEN: As you know, Your Honor, pursuant to a prior Order of the Court, we sent out letters to almost 100,000, I believe, claimants who had submitted Proofs of Claim which were, as we thought them to be, deficient in nature, and we've received some limited responses with respect to those. And as Ms. Stafford, who is sitting in the courtroom, will go through in a little bit in connection with the administrative claims reconciliation process, we've actually -- based upon those responses, we filed, I believe, Omnibus objections to approximately 16,000 claims last week, hopefully removing those from the docket at the next Omnibus hearing, I believe, in December.

Many of those claims initially we thought might be earmarked for the ADR process, but in the fact that they are, in fact, totally deficient and will probably be dismissed, that amount of claims will be removed and it will be a much smaller number, a universe. Likewise, if the administrative claims reconciliation procedure is granted today, tens of thousands of claims will likewise be removed from the Court registry and hopefully put in a side-by-side registry, as Ms. Stafford will go through, but there will be fewer claims, therefore, for an ADR process.

The glitches I believe ultimately fell upon it in connection with the ADR was with respect to the binding

arbitration. As Your Honor will recall, when you gave us your ideas in July, that was something that everyone thought was -- we should try to do that. In fact, the Unsecured Creditors

Committee had even suggested that there be some form of binding arbitration.

Unfortunately, when we investigated the process, we found that the minimum amount, cost, associated with a binding arbitration was approximately \$5,000 per claim. And by just extrapolating that out, we saw over a hundred million dollars if, in fact, all those claims had to go to binding arbitration. And that was something the Commonwealth just felt it could not bear, inasmuch as the Court likewise could not bear the responsibility for that.

I was heartened to see Mr. Mudd's pleading yesterday where he said that he had actually been in communication with an entity that might be able to provide services. I don't know if those would be free of charge, Your Honor, or those might carry a fee associated with it, but we're trying to find a way to do the binding arbitration and have it be a de minimis cost to the government itself. I don't know if we will be successful.

And I do acknowledge that the Court really cannot be in the binding arbitration business, but if, in fact, we're successful in doing that, then those would have to be just claims objections, Your Honor, that we would have to bring to

the Court, subject to the other ADR components that we thought would be helpful in expediting that process. But that's really where we're stuck, Your Honor. It's arbitration.

THE COURT: Well, there is also -- well, we've been talking. Your proposals have used the nomenclature "mediation" for some limited features, like a targeted number for settlement, that sort of thing.

MR. ROSEN: Yes.

THE COURT: There are models of mediation that, shall I say, are a little bit more aggressive about seeking to lead people to settlement as opposed to merely facilitating discussions. And if there is going to be a proposal that the court system come up with people to perform a mediation function, whether that's more a settlement judge function or an evaluator function, that's something that, you know, we need to be able to anticipate structurally and see whether we could staff it.

And I understand that we're all a little bit in the dark as to the ultimate likely volume, but while binding arbitration with informed consent and at a reasonable cost would be great, a front end aggressive settlement opportunity might also be helpful. And that might be something that we could be a part of or coordinate in some way, because that's also something that nonjudicial mediators, properly trained, if available, could be involved in.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ROSEN: Yes, Your Honor. Ms. Abdelmasieh did suggest that and said it was used in another situation. Ms. Stafford and I have had conversations with her about that. And if that's a process that the Court would like us to undertake, we'll discuss it again and come back to Ms. Abdelmasieh with respect to that. That would be helpful. Again, we're THE COURT: trying to figure out whether, at the end of the day, you're going to be looking to us. And if you are, we want to be able to have something to respond to that we can deliver on. MR. ROSEN: Absolutely. THE COURT: But we don't want to undertake anything that's unnecessary. If I can just go back for a minute to the request letters and the Omnibus Objections that have been filed, would you just give me a sense of what criteria you used to determine that a claim was sufficiently deficient, that it required a letter and is now properly the subject of one of these Omnibus Objections? MR. ROSEN: Yes, Your Honor. If I could actually defer to Ms. Stafford, who's sitting with you in that courtroom, because she's been working directly with Alvarez & Marsal, and putting that together and sending those out. THE COURT: Good morning, Ms. Stafford. MS. STAFFORD: Good morning. Ms. Stafford from

Proskauer Rose for the Financial Oversight and Management Board.

So for the Omnibus Objections that we set for the December Omnibus hearing, those particular objections, we really were focused on identifying claims that were as a -- that really didn't provide any sort of detail, any sort of documentation or supporting information. Each one of those claims is essentially just a claim form with no supporting documentation attached.

And when we were working through the process of identifying which claim forms don't provide us with enough information, in addition to not having any supporting documentation, we were focused on claims that sought -- that had identified either employee benefits writ large as the basis for their claim, but didn't provide any specific information about what benefits were being sought, whether there was any administrative process that the claimant had begun working through with the Commonwealth procedures, or anything along those lines that might provide some indication of how we could go about finding whether or not there was an actual basis to the claim.

So the ones that were set for the December Omnibus hearing are ones than essentially just provide very broad, nonspecific explanations of what it is that they are trying to claim, such as employee benefits, or the statement of Law 50

or Law 80 or something along those lines that would provide some -- that doesn't provide us with enough information to understand how that law may have resulted in liabilities owed to that claimant. That gives you a little bit of background about what was set for the December Omnibus hearing.

In terms of the letter procedures and the hundred thousand letters that were sent out, we sent those letters out to anyone who did not provide us with enough information to understand, for example, if they were asserting a bond claim, what the CUSIP number of that bond may have been, or what bond was specifically being asserted; with respect to litigation claims, if there was no information about the specific case number that the claimant had against -- in the Commonwealth systems.

So if you have any questions about the -- either the letters or the December objections, I'm happy to answer them.

THE COURT: That's very helpful.

MR. ROSEN: Your Honor, I'm sorry. If I could just add one other thing, Your Honor. If you recall, as we neared the bar date itself, there was an influx or lines that formed around blocks with people filing claims. Many of these people felt they -- or were told they had to file claims. And unfortunately, there were attorneys who came forward and said, give me a certain amount of money and I will help you and I will assist you in filing a Proof of Claim.

Many of these claims really didn't even have -- many of the claimants didn't even have claims themselves. And what we've been finding with the numerous letters we've sent out, the hundred thousand letters, we're really cleaning up those that really shouldn't have been filed in the first place because they didn't have any claim, and they had nothing to substantiate the claim that was filed. That's what's coming on in the next Omnibus hearing.

THE COURT: Thank you. And I had suspected that. It's good to hear you make that more concrete.

And in terms of my being able ultimately to be comfortable with the process and the opportunity for people to be heard, am I correct in thinking of these as claims that would have been filed in our claims process, which of course postdated the hurricanes? So it would have been people who knew about the claims process, who filed a paper with a post-hurricane address on it, and in the context of information that had gone out that included notification of their obligation to keep the address current or have some way of responding to objections to their claims, the letters would have been sent out to those addresses, not responded to, and now there is motion practice again being sent out to those addresses so that they again have an opportunity to come forward before anything is done by way of expunging the claim? Would that be correct?

1 MS. STAFFORD: That's correct, Your Honor. 2 MR. ROSEN: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you. I appreciate your confirming THE COURT: 3 that. 4 5 And so going back to the ADR type process, we should 6 anticipate that there'll be further contact with Ms. 7 Abdelmasieh, and that that will be helpful to us in determining the timing, deployment and pace of focus of our 8 resources? 9 MR. ROSEN: Yes, Your Honor. Ms. Stafford and I will 10 be in contact with her probably later this week, and hopefully 11 we'll get something on file real soon. 12 Thank you. Much appreciated. THE COURT: 13 Thank you, Your Honor. MS. STAFFORD: 14 THE COURT: Thank you both. 15 16 Mr. Despins. MR. DESPINS: Good morning, Your Honor. Luc Despins 17 with Paul Hastings on behalf of the Official Committee. 18 will not be long. Just two issues. 19 I fully understood that you had entered an Order 20 21 allowing them to send letters to claimants, but I don't -- and I'll check that so we don't need to spend a lot of time, but I 22 don't recall the Court entered an Order authorizing the filing 23 of Omnibus Objections to Commonwealth claims. But we --24 THE COURT: Well, there have been a couple of 25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

variations on Orders authorizing Omnibus Objections to Commonwealth claims. MR. DESPINS: To duplicate claims, et cetera, but this has gone beyond that I believe. THE COURT: Well, there was a second phase Order that increased the cap number per Omnibus Objection and had some broader language about nonsubstantive claims. And so I'm assuming that the debtors are taking the position that a claim that says, I have a piece of paper that has no information on it that I can understand and, therefore, should be expunged is a nonsubstantive claim. Would that be generally correct, Ms. Stafford? MS. STAFFORD: Yes, that would. And also, the Order that was entered relating to the proposed mailings and the proposed mailing itself both indicated that if no response was received, we would be able to proceed with Omnibus objections against those claims. THE COURT: And so perhaps offline, you can point Mr. Despins to the docket entry numbers of those Orders. MS. STAFFORD: I'd be happy to. THE COURT: Thank you. That's really not my main point. MR. DESPINS: main point on the ADR, Your Honor, is that we are not included

in this process. These are our claimants that we're dealing

And we've suggested mandatory ADR Detroit style, as

Your Honor suggested in July -- back in June -- I'm sorry,

January 2018. And the Board has to date steadfastly refused

to go that direction or to include us in the discussion of why

that doesn't work or why it cannot be done.

From the point of view of the claimants, Your Honor, they don't have money. For them to appear in front of a magistrate and all that, that whole procedure, and then appeals that can ensue from that, they cannot afford that. That's why the arbitration is so critical.

THE COURT: Yet you have to have somebody to do the arbitration.

MR. DESPINS: Yes, but the government pays for that, not the claimants. So I understand there's a process in order to weed out just the claims that are material enough to warrant arbitration, but the point is that -- from the Committee's point of view, is that we should be front and center in that process and we're not.

THE COURT: Blame PROMESA, again, that gives control of the process, the leadership in proposing these mechanisms to the debtors' representative, which is the Oversight Board.

MR. DESPINS: Absolutely.

THE COURT: But I do encourage you to be, you know, early, often, persistent and robust in any constructive help that you can offer to the Oversight Board.

MR. DESPINS: So --

THE COURT: And there will be -- once something is proposed publicly, there will be plenty of opportunity to interrogate that, as we stated in July.

MR. DESPINS: I know, but that's not the way it should work. At the end of the day, that's not a productive way of doing things. But we will try. We will take you -- not you, but we'll take the Board up on your suggestion there.

THE COURT: I hear your commentary and I accept your constructive criticism.

MR. DESPINS: Moving on to a totally different topic, but still related to the presentation by Mr. Bienenstock, PREPA. There's something, Your Honor, that's going on that's a bit bizarre here. You know, you've often referred to the litigation machine in the case, and that machine is going on full steam ahead in PREPA. You know that. Judge Dein knows that.

And so you might say, well, why is he raising it.

I'm raising this because as recently as October 1st, the head of AAFAF, talking to the newspapers, said that the AAFAF and the government are reviewing the terms of the PREPA RSA.

And, well, so put that aside for a second. Yesterday the Governor said that she is -- it would be premature for people to conclude that she has signed off on the rate increases reflected in the RSA. And by the way, we have no

problems with that, I mean, in the sense that a new Governor should take the time to do that. But what's happening is that we are going full steam ahead at a very high clip on a hearing that now is going to be postponed until January, when that hearing may never happen.

So I just want to make sure the Court is aware of it. There's something that doesn't add up here. If they want to take the time to determine whether they should support it or not, God bless them, but let's not go through with this pretend litigation that may never happen.

So I raised it with Mr. Bienenstock. I raised it with Mr. Friedman yesterday. I don't see in New York whether Mr. Friedman is there or not. But that's not -- there's something that is not right there. Either they're on board, which is not fine because we're against the deal, or they're not on board, but the estate should not be spending tons of money on a litigation that may never occur.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Bienenstock, would you like to respond?

MR. BIENENSTOCK: Thank you, Your Honor. As

Mr. Despins and I discussed earlier, we have a joint interest
in not wanting time and fees to be expended needlessly. The

bottom line here is that the Oversight Board is committed to a

more efficient energy production system for Puerto Rico. This

goes not only to the debt restructuring, but to the very essence of the economic sustainability that we're supposed to provide. There has to be a conversion to a less expensive form and cleaner form of energy.

Mr. Despins' comments about the Governor's comments and the legislature's comments are accurate. And we've learned, that's a way of life. We're in a political system here.

And they did sign the RSA, Your Honor. There are other things that the Governor and/or legislature may have to do to get the ultimate arrangement consummated, and those are the things that, if they decide not to do them, would definitely throw a wrench in the works; but we don't see that stopping things because they might do something in the future is the right thing for Puerto Rico. All of the -- any delay in getting to a sustainable economy is a much bigger cost than the litigation cost from now until a January hearing.

So yes, we share their concern about costs and expenses, and I think on all sides, people are doing what they can to minimize them, but we are in a political system. We have to live with that. We -- there are some things we can't tie down, the Governor or the legislature or even know who is the right person to tie down on some issues. We just have to live with that. And we can't stop, because there's not going to be a solution. We believe if we get to a point where we

have a good solution, there will be a lot of pressure on everyone to get it done, and that's what we're trying to accomplish.

THE COURT: Thank you.

And I will assume that Mr. Friedman, who I think is in New York, or Mr. Rapisardi, will have some comments from the government perspective on that, too.

MR. BIENENSTOCK: Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

All right. And so, Mr. Friedman, good morning.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Good morning, Your Honor. It's Peter Friedman of O'Melveny & Myers on behalf of AAFAF. I will address PREPA and Mr. Despins' remarks, as well as give the status update that the Court requested.

Your Honor, I echo Mr. Bienenstock's remarks on several fronts, one being the extraordinary importance of transformation of the electrical system to Puerto Rico. And enhanced resiliency, enhanced economic performance, are all extraordinarily important, as is progress in the Title III.

As Mr. Bienenstock correctly noted, there are governmental and political factors that unfold around us as the transformation process goes on, but fundamentally, this is a joint motion between the Board and AAFAF and PREPA. And it's our view that we should continue moving forward. And if that changes, obviously we'll let the Court know. But it's

our motion together, and we don't think Mr. Despins' suspicions or concerns or, you know, statements that something more than meets the eye is going on here are justification in any way, shape or form for pausing the continued march towards the transformation process.

Your Honor, stepping back more broadly, after the recent transformation in government and the transition, both Governor Vazquez and AAFAF's new executive director, Omar Marrero, and the Governor's ex officio representative to the board, Ali Diaz, have begun and continued the process of both working with the Oversight Board, working with federal agencies, meeting with creditors, and moving forward with all aspects of Puerto Rico's debt restructuring.

With respect to the Oversight Board's Plan of Adjustment, which Mr. Bienenstock mentioned, AAFAF has coordinated and communicated extensively with the Oversight Board. On September 27, Governor Vazquez stated publicly that the best option is to consider approval of the Plan. AAFAF recognizes the progress made so far, and hopes as much as possible for consensus and productive negotiations and disclosure of information.

In connection with that, AAFAF aided the Oversight Board in developing an analysis of the government's cash position, focusing on bank accounts as of June 30th, 2019. On October 18, AAFAF posted the bank account report on EMMA, the

municipal securities disclosure website. And as

Mr. Bienenstock also mentioned, various nonTitle III

restructurings are under negotiations, with AAFAF taking the

lead and, as necessary, seeking approval from the Oversight

Board at the right time.

With respect to other initiatives, since our last report to the Court, Governor Vazquez, Executive Director Marrero and other governmental leaders have been working with all agencies, the Puerto Rico Government, to promote visibility into public finances. And October 10th of this year, Governor Vazquez held a day-long fiscal policy summit with various Commonwealth agency chiefs, which was focused in particular on ensuring strict compliance with certified fiscal plans and budgets established by the Oversight Board.

Just last week, on October 25, Governor Vazquez issued two Executive Orders that I believe are very important to the PROMESA process. First, Executive Order 56 centralizes strategies and actions concerning the Federal Government and the Oversight Board. Under Executive Order 56, all Puerto Rico executive branch agencies and public corporations must channel pending federal matters through Ali Diaz, who, as I mentioned, is the Governor's Oversight Board representative, who will work with the Puerto Rico Governor's Office and Puerto Rico's Federal Affairs Administration to coordinate as much as possible.

In addition, Executive Order 57 establishes uniform procedures for compliance with Section 204(a) of PROMESA and the certification of -- and certifications. As the Court knows, PROMESA Section 204(a) requires the Governor of Puerto Rico to submit enacted laws to the Oversight Board with estimates regarding the impact, if any, that laws will have on expenditures and revenues, certifications of findings that laws are not significantly inconsistent with fiscal plans.

Executive Order 57 directs AAFAF and OMB of Puerto Rico to prepare forms that include formal budget impact estimates, fiscal plan consistency certifications before the enactment of bills or joint resolutions, after which agencies must strictly and punctually comply with related terms. And the goals there, I think, are obvious as to what they are trying to promote, the best possible coordination with AAFAF and ultimately -- throughout the government and ultimately with the Oversight Board.

In addition, in October, AAFAF disclosed draft regulations under Puerto Rico's Fiscal Plan Compliance Act with respect to the transfer of real estate owned by the executive branch in order to streamline processes concerning real estate assets.

With respect to the Federal Government,

Mr. Bienenstock mentioned the testimony before Congress that

Ms. Jaresko gave in earlier October with respect to draft

amendments of PROMESA and effectively a check-up on how PROMESA is working. Omar Marrero testified that day. Governor Vazquez was actually meeting with the U.S. Department of Education to address federal funding for Puerto Rico's public education system.

Mr. Marrero addressed some of the successes and some of the challenges of PROMESA and gave comments through his written and oral testimony with respect to areas of feedback going forward. Of note, I think, Representative Bishop, who's the ranking member of the Natural Resources Committee, who has sometimes been harshly critical of the government, said on the record that, Governor Vazquez is doing, I think, a remarkable job, as she sat in my office and promised to solve these issues by working with the Board. And I'm proud of the Board trying to now work with the Governor. And if we go forward with that, then you can accomplish something that's positive.

With respect to federal funding, on October 11, 2019, COR3, which is Puerto Rico's Central Office of Recovery, Reconstruction and Resiliency, announced that FEMA has extended the deadline to submit fixed cost estimates for post hurricane recovery projects pursuant to the Stafford Act. And this will allow FEMA, the Commonwealth and various applicants to continue to develop and implement fixed cost estimate agreements for damage caused by Hurricane Maria. We think this shows that obviously, while there are issues with FEMA

and the release of federal funding, this shows that communication and coordination with FEMA can be quite positive.

The last thing I wanted to mention, Your Honor, was just announced publicly yesterday, which COFINA rolled out a new project aimed at improving investor engagement and additional transparency and disclosure for COFINA bondholders and new potential investors. COFINA rolled out a platform, which is, I think, a first for Puerto Rico, a corporate style investor relations site featuring substantial data and documentation, detailing credit fundamentals behind COFINA bonds and why the corporation's credit profile is strong.

And COFINA also announced that it will be using a new reporting system with respect to the SUT, on the publication of monthly SUT collections and monthly distribution reports in order that it is clear to the public that the manner of distribution and collection of COFINA funds set forth in COFINA's confirmed and effective Plan of Adjustment is being done. And it delineates the amount that each party owns, is entitled to receive. And, you know, those flow from COFINA's highly successful restructuring and should provide investors with the necessary information to have confidence in COFINA's bonds.

I thank you, Your Honor. And if you have any questions, I'll do my best to answer them.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Friedman. I have no questions for you at this time. That was a very comprehensive report.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

Examiner's Report. I've reviewed the report and I found satisfactory its discussion of the matters that it covers, which include final approval of the fees for the COFINA agent and her advisors, as well as a report on the Fee Examiner's investigations regarding McKinsey, recommendations regarding McKinsey's fees and new steps to be taken in respect of that engagement. And the Court has entered the Proposed Orders and, therefore, excused the Fee Examiner and his counsel from attending today's hearing.

Now, I have -- I would like to take the Agenda a little bit out of order given that we're coming close to that 10:30 time. And so I would suggest -- well, actually, before we go there -- well, let's go to the uncontested matters. And I will simply say that Proposed Orders were filed on presentment yesterday, and the Court intends to enter those Proposed Orders sustaining the objections to which there have been no responses.

And so from there, I suggest going to the contested claim objections, which are Agenda Items IV.2 through 5, and at 10:30, we'll see if there's anyone who wishes to speak as

to number 4. But if we start with number two, I think we can make some progress between now and 10:30.

MS. STAFFORD: That sounds great, Your Honor. Laura Stafford again from Proskauer Rose for the Oversight Board.

I'll begin with the 64th Omnibus Objection, if that works.

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. STAFFORD: This was the 64th Omnibus Objection filed by the Commonwealth to claims based on investments and mutual funds. There's one remaining claim from this objection that at the last Omnibus hearing, at the request of the claimant, the Court had adjourned consideration of the Commonwealth's objection to this claim, pending submission of additional documentation regarding liquidation of the mutual funds in which the claimant, the Noreen Wiscovitch Retirement Plan, had invested.

Instead of submitting additional documentation, the retirement plan filed an amended claim, which is now Proof of Claim number 171656. Because the Wiscovitch Retirement Plan amended its original Proof of Claim, we think the best approach at this stage is to disallow the original claim as amended and superseded by the subsequently filed claim, such that the parties can properly address the amended claim, including any objections thereto, and present any arguments regarding that claim to the Court on proper notice and with a

proper objection. And I don't know if she --2 THE COURT: Yes, I believe Ms. Wiscovitch-Rentas is 3 4 here. 5 MS. WISCOVITCH RENTAS: Good morning, Your Honor. 6 Noreen Wiscovitch on behalf of the Noreen Wiscovitch 7 Retirement Plan. Your Honor, I think that the matter is ripe to be 8 ruled upon today. The Court allowed me to provide additional 9 documentation to prove that there was a redemption of one of 10 11 the funds, and the claim was amended to reflect that. Also, there was an informative motion to the Court on October 9th 12 indicating this amendment. So the debtor had enough time to 13 14 file a response or a reply. This is not a new claim. It was amended. So I will 15 16 object to any type of disallowance of the claim, per se, because it's the same claim. It's just been amended. 17 THE COURT: Why did you amend the claim? 18 MS. WISCOVITCH RENTAS: Because Your Honor had 19 requested additional documents, so the claim was reduced to 20 21 the amount that was liquidated by redemption on one of the So the claim now stands at \$25,219.50, and it has the 22 funds. documents in support of that attached to it. 23 See, the debtors' main argument was that all the 24 claimants on the 64th Omnibus Objection did not have standing 25

to file their Proof of Claim because the funds were the ones that were the owners of the claim, per se. And that in my case particularly, it already had been settled with COFINA.

My argument was that perhaps I had two separate joint claims at that time, two separate funds, but one fund in particular was redeemed. And that was the amount of the loss that was provided, and the documents are attached to the claim. So it's really amending claim -- and I used ECF, CM/ECF, so it's really claim number 1091-2, which is the same claim. I didn't file a new claim, so it shouldn't be disallowed. It has been superseded by claim number 1091-2, with the documents requested by the Court.

And perhaps Your Honor was expecting me to file the documents in the docket, but I did file an informative motion of this indicating that the documents were attached to the claim.

THE COURT: And so your position still is that you are entitled to recover, based on the difference between the amount that you received in liquidation of your mutual fund holding and the amount that you believe the mutual fund should have been able to -- should be able to recover and pass through to you based on your being a shareholder of the mutual fund?

MS. WISCOVITCH RENTAS: Yes, based on the redemption obviously was among all the shareholders of the mutual fund.

So they distributed the whole amount that they had at that 2 time. 3 THE COURT: And so you --MS. WISCOVITCH RENTAS: My standing now, it covers --4 5 because I no longer have an intermediary mutual fund. I am 6 the one who has been damaged. I have standing to bring this 7 damage before the Court. So --THE COURT: The investment that you held was an 8 investment in a mutual fund. You never held the bonds 9 directly, correct? 10 MS. WISCOVITCH RENTAS: That's correct, Your Honor. 11 12 THE COURT: That's what I just wanted to make sure that I understood properly. 13 MS. WISCOVITCH RENTAS: That's correct. 14 THE COURT: And the new amended claim is based on 15 that same status or former relationship with the mutual fund, 16 as a mutual fund interest holder who has suffered losses? 17 MS. WISCOVITCH RENTAS: Yes, Your Honor. 18 THE COURT: And if we were to go forward today, would 19 you accept my ruling on your original claim and the amended 20 21 claim as a ruling that deals conclusively at this court level with both the original claim and the amended claim? 22 MS. WISCOVITCH RENTAS: Your Honor will rule 23 24 whichever way Your Honor feels like it obviously, but I think that now I have been able to circumvent the argument by the 25

debtor stating that I did not have any standing, which was the main argument for the first objection. And that's the difference today. Today I come here saying no, I do have standing. I am not -- did not receive the losses pursuant to derivative action basically from this fund, except that now I have actual losses that I can show and I have the evidence showing how much the account is.

So it's a little bit different than what the first objection was. But I presented at the last hearing. I said I was going to file the documents. I filed the documents. I have shown them. And I think that the matter is ripe, Your Honor.

The main cases that debtor has argued before -again, it's regarding whether or not the individual claimants
had standing or not to bring this action, that it was the fund
who actually held the claims against the debtor, and because
of that, they should be disallowed. In this case, I no longer
have the fund in the middle. I am the one who had the loss.
And that's the one point I wanted to bring to the Court, to
consider it.

So I disagree with the debtor at this point that they should be -- my claim should be disallowed as to the first claim, and then they have an opportunity to object to the amended claim because it's just one claim. There's not two different claims, just one claim, which have been argued and

presented and all the evidence is there.

THE COURT: And so even though there is not a formal written objection to the amended claim, you would agree to go forward with my hearing argument and making a decision on your clarified, refined, amended claim, which is that, I was a mutual fund shareholder; that mutual fund, which held the bonds or the instruments, was liquidated; I received less than I believe I was entitled to receive in that liquidation; and because of that loss, that loss on the investment that was made through the mutual fund, I have standing to make a claim directly against the issuer of the bonds that the mutual fund had held?

MS. WISCOVITCH RENTAS: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

I'll hear a response from Ms. Stafford.

MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor. I think
that -- I hear the claimant is willing to proceed on the
amended claim, despite the fact that there is no additional
objection pending with respect to that amended claim, even
though there's two claims that are currently outstanding that
have been filed by Ms. Wiscovitch.

THE COURT: Can you slow down a little bit and just articulate a little bit more clearly?

MS. STAFFORD: Sure.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MS. STAFFORD: The results of the liquidation of the mutual funds still do not provide standing to this claimant to assert a claim directly against the Commonwealth, because as Your Honor stated earlier, the claimant still at no point owned the bonds that were asserted against the Commonwealth, and had an ownership interest in and, therefore, a right to assert those bonds against the Commonwealth or any of the other debtors.

What the claimant is now claiming are the investment losses that she suffered as a result of the sale of those bonds, which is not the same as an assertion of principal and interest of those bonds against the Commonwealth and the debtors. So we would respectfully request that the claims still be — that both the original and the amended claim still be disallowed, in light of the fact that there's no direct claim and no direct ownership of bonds by the claimant.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

I have considered very carefully all of the filings and reviewed the additional documents submitted by

Ms. Wiscovitch Rentas. Those documents confirm, and she has also confirmed today here on the record, that her retirement plan owned shares in a mutual fund and did not hold directly any bonds issued by any Title III debtor.

That documentation is consistent with her position

that the funds' shares were redeemed, and that in the redemption of those fund shares, the retirement plan sustained a loss in excess of \$25,000. The amended claim is clearly based on that loss from that redemption. Unfortunately, nothing in this supplemental and clarified documentation demonstrates that, as a legal matter, the retirement plan has any valid, direct claim against any of the debtors.

The retirement plan held an interest in the mutual fund. They received a distribution from the mutual fund. And the retirement plan does not succeed to the rights of the mutual fund itself, whatever those were, in the mutual fund's holdings. Therefore, consistent with this Court's rulings at the September 11th, 2019, Omnibus hearing, the retirement plan lacks standing to assert the direct claims against the debtors that were asserted in the original Proof of Claim and in the Amended Proof of Claim. And so the debtors' objections to those proofs of claim are sustained.

Ms. Stafford, there was also outstanding, with respect to the 64th Omnibus Objection, some -- a documentation question as to a bond held by Mr. Librada Sanz. And I gather that the documentation that I asked for has been submitted to show that the CUSIP number matches the CUSIP number covered by the Master Proof of Claim?

MS. STAFFORD: That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. So for that reason, and for

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the reasons stated on the record of the September 11, 2019, Omnibus hearing and the explanation that I have just given with respect to the Wiscovitch Retirement Plan claims, the Oversight Board is directed to submit a Proposed Order sustaining the 64th Omnibus Objection in its entirety, and also sustaining the objection to the amended Wiscovitch Retirement Plan claim. So I think that covers the 64th Omnibus. MS. STAFFORD: I think that's correct, Your Honor. Thank you. THE COURT: And I also thank you, Ms. Wiscovitch. MS. WISCOVITCH RENTAS: Thank you. THE COURT: So it is 10:30. Is there anyone here who wishes to speak on behalf of JRF Gold Corporation in connection with the 72nd Omnibus Objection? (No response.) THE COURT: Okay. So seeing no one, let's just take them in order. Let's go to number three, the 69th objection. MS. STAFFORD: Sure. The 69th Omnibus Objection was filed by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the Employee's Retirement System of the Government of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico to claims that have been satisfied. This objection seeks to disallow nine proofs of claim that were fully satisfied by either the Commonwealth or by Each of these claims purports to assert liability based ERS.

on a contract, purchase order or invoice entered into or issued by either the Commonwealth or one of its agencies, but the records of either the Commonwealth, its agencies or ERS indicate that the liabilities associated with these proofs of claim have been fully paid. And this is ECF Number 8695, for the record.

There's only one response that was filed by the Ponce Real Estate Corporation. That's ECF Number 8780. And it relates to Proof of Claim number 18335. And I will just give a brief amount of background about the Proof of Claim itself, which asserted a total liability of \$45,606, reflecting rent owed to Ponce Real Estate from July 2017 through May of 2018.

The response asserts that the Proof of Claim is not fully satisfied on the grounds that the Commonwealth owes additional liabilities because of one of its agencies, the State Elections Commission, continued to occupy the property for several months after May 2018. Ponce Real Estate further states it filed an amended claim asserting liabilities owed from August 2018 through February of 2019.

As Your Honor is aware, however, Ponce Real Estate had filed a motion requesting administrative rent payments in September of 2018. And in December of 2018, the parties reached an agreement with respect to those rent payments. In light of that agreement, the Commonwealth issued checks to Ponce Real Estate totaling \$62,190 in rent payments. And of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that total, the 45,606 were paid to cover rents owed between July 2017 and May 2018. So as set forth in the Objection and in the reply, the liabilities asserted by Proof of Claim number 18335, which again cover rent owed from July 2017 through May 2018, have already been paid. The Ponce Real Estate response does not dispute that those amounts were paid in satisfaction of the original claim. To the extent that Ponce Real Estate believes it is owed additional money reflecting rents owed from June 2018 or August 2018 forward, respectfully, those liabilities are covered by Ponce Real Estate's amended claim and are not subject to the pending objection or before the Court at this time. So we would request that the Proof of Claim be disallowed, not withstanding the objection, in light of the fact that Ponce Real Estate does not dispute that the liabilities asserted by the original claim have been paid. THE COURT: And that Amended Proof of Claim was filed on September 27th; is that correct? MS. STAFFORD: Correct, Your Honor. THE COURT: And what is the number of that Amended Proof of Claim? MS. STAFFORD: That is -- I don't have it with me right now, but I can submit something.

THE COURT: All right. But if I refer to it as the

1 September 27 Proof of Claim --2 MS. STAFFORD: Certainly. THE COURT: -- you know what I'm talking about? 3 MS. STAFFORD: I certainly do, yes. 4 5 THE COURT: And I'm using that for the September 27 6 claim, the Amended Proof of Claim. 7 Is there anyone who wishes to be heard on behalf of Ponce Real Estate Corporation? 8 9 (No response.) THE COURT: The Court's reviewed everything carefully 10 11 and has listened carefully. The response to the 69th Omnibus Objection filed by the Ponce Real Estate Corporation is 12 overruled as to the original Proof of Claim, which is the 13 subject of that objection, that is, Proof of Claim 18835, and 14 the 69th Omnibus Objection is sustained in its entirety. 15 The 16 Proofs of Claim listed on Exhibit A to the 69th Omnibus Objection are disallowed. And on submission, the Court will 17 enter an order overruling the response filed by Ponce Real 18 Estate Corporation and sustaining that 69th Omnibus. 19 For clarity, this ruling does not affect the Amended 20 21 Proof of Claim filed on September 27th, 2019, which was not a subject of the 69th Omnibus Objection. 22 MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor. 23 24 THE COURT: Thank you. And so now we go to Agenda Item IV.4, which is the 25

72nd Omnibus Objection.

MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

The 72nd Omnibus Objection was filed by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico to bondholder claims asserting amounts for which the Commonwealth is not liable. This is ECF Number 8698, for the record.

This objection seeks to disallow in their entirety 56 proofs of claim that assert liabilities falling into one of three categories: They either assert ownership interest in bonds issued by COFINA; they assert ownership interest in bonds issued by GDB; and/or they assert investments in mutual funds, which in turn may have invested in bonds issued by the Commonwealth.

Only one response was filed by JRF Gold Distributors. That's ECF number 8812, and it relates to Proof of Claim number 16312. This Proof of Claim sought to assert COFINA bonds against the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, but as the Court is well aware, pursuant to the Court's Orders approving the Settlement Agreement between COFINA and the Commonwealth and confirming a Plan of Adjustment for COFINA, all claims against the Commonwealth arising from its relationship with COFINA have been settled, released and discharged.

This Proof of Claim also sought to assert investments in mutual funds. However, because, as we have addressed earlier today, only the mutual fund and not the individual

investor in a mutual fund is a creditor of the Commonwealth,

JRF Gold lacks standing to assert a claim directly against the

Commonwealth in respect to those mutual funds' investments.

The JRF Gold response does not substantively address these arguments and simply states that the claimant does not approve of the objection because it is against the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Because the response does not dispute that the Order approving the settlement between COFINA and the Commonwealth and the Order confirming the COFINA Plan settles, releases and discharges all claims arising from the relationship between COFINA and the Commonwealth, and also, it does not dispute that, as an investor in mutual funds, JRF Gold lacks standing to assert a direct claim against the Commonwealth, I would respectfully request that the objection be sustained and the claim be disallowed, not withstanding the response.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Once again, is there anyone who wishes to be heard on behalf of JRF Gold Distributors?

(No response.)

THE COURT: Seeing no one, I will rule. I've read carefully all of the submissions and listened carefully to the argument. The --

Sir, are you here for JRF Gold Distributors by any chance?

1 UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: No. 2 THE COURT: Thank you. The response filed by JRF Gold Distributors is 3 4 overruled, and the 72nd Omnibus Objection is sustained in its To the extent that JRF Gold Distributors' Proof of 5 entirety. 6 Claim asserts liabilities associated with its investments in 7 mutual funds, JRF Gold Distributors lacks standing to assert claims based -- to assert claims against the Commonwealth or 8 any other debtor entity based on those investments. Those are 9 claims that would belong to the mutual funds. Additionally, 10 to the extent that JRF Gold Distributors asserts liability 11 based on alleged ownership of COFINA bonds, the claim has been 12 discharged pursuant to the Court's Orders confirming the 13 COFINA Plan. 14 The proofs of claim listed on Exhibit A to the 72nd 15 Omnibus Objection are disallowed in their entirety, and the 16 Court will enter an Order overruling the response filed by JRF 17 Gold Distributors and sustaining the 72nd Omnibus Objection. 18 Thank you, Your Honor. 19 MS. STAFFORD: THE COURT: Thank you. And so --20 MS. STAFFORD: Sorry. Moving on to the 73rd Omnibus 21 Objection, with your permission. 22 THE COURT: Which is Agenda Item IV.5, correct? 23 MS. STAFFORD: Correct. 24 The 73rd Omnibus Objection was filed by the 25

Commonwealth of Puerto Rico to bondholder claims, asserting amounts for which the Commonwealth is not liable. And for the record, it is ECF number 8699.

This claim seeks to disallow in their entirety 74 proofs of claim that assert liabilities falling into the same three categories I addressed earlier: That they assert interest ownership in bonds issued by COFINA, assert ownership interest in bonds issued by GDB, and/or assert investments in mutual funds, which in turn may have invested in bonds issued by the Commonwealth.

Only one response was filed by an individual bondholder, Patricia Moscoso. That is ECF number 8855 and addresses Proof of Claim number 31833. Ms. Moscoso asserted liabilities arising from her ownership of COFINA bonds. Ms. Moscoso disputes the 73rd Objection because she asserts that her claim was not released or discharged by the Court's settlement Order, in light of the fact that her claim was not specifically before the Court when the settlement Order and Plan of Adjustment was confirmed.

As set forth in our Reply, however, both the settlement Order and the confirmation Order are broader than Ms. Moscoso suggests and resolve all claims arising from the relationship between COFINA and the Commonwealth, including assertions that the Commonwealth is in some way liable for payment of bonds issued by COFINA. So accordingly, Your

Honor, we would respectfully request that the Court sustain the objection and disallow the claim, not withstanding the response.

THE COURT: Is there anyone here wishing to be heard on behalf of Ms. Moscoso?

(No response.)

THE COURT: Seeing no one, I will rule. I have read very carefully the submission and listened carefully to the argument. The response filed by Ms. Moscoso is overruled, and the 73rd Omnibus Objection is sustained in its entirety.

To the extent Ms. Moscoso asserts liability based on her alleged ownership of COFINA bonds, the claim has been discharged pursuant to the Court's Order on the 9019 motion, the amended confirmation Order with respect to COFINA and the COFINA Plan. The proofs of claim listed on Exhibit A to the 73rd Omnibus Objection are thus disallowed in part.

To the extent that the claims listed on Exhibit A assert liability based on the ownership of bonds issued by the Commonwealth, claimants will retain remaining claims in the Commonwealth Title III case in the respective amounts listed in the column titled "corrected" in Exhibit A. And the Court will enter an Order overruling the response filed by

Ms. Moscoso, disallowing the claims listed in Exhibit A to the 73rd Omnibus Objection in part, and sustaining in all other -- in all respects, the 73rd Omnibus Objection.

MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. So that takes care of Agenda Items IV.2 through 5, which leaves us with Agenda Item IV.1, the ACR procedures motion.

MS. STAFFORD: Correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Stafford.

MS. STAFFORD: Thank you.

This ACR motion seeks the Court's approval of a procedure to expedite and streamline the claims process by allowing certain claims to be reconciled using existing administrative processes at the Commonwealth. The claims in question here, which we defined in the motion as tax refund claims, pension retiree claims, public employee claims and grievance claims are all administrative in nature. And by that, we mean that they are claims against the Title III debtors that would ordinarily be handled by the Commonwealth's routine administrative processes.

Importantly, these are all also claims that did not even need to be filed in the first place. For that reason, each of these types of claims were expressly carved out of the bar date Order that was entered last year. The bar date Order expressly states that certain persons or entities are not required to file a claim, and that included claims for, and I quote, pension benefits and any and all other post retirement benefits, as well as compensation and employment benefits.

Pursuant to their authority under PROMESA Section

305, the debtors intend to pay the liabilities associated with each of these claims dollar for dollar, in accordance with the outcomes of whichever administrative procedures they're subject to. Nevertheless, many thousands of these claims have been filed, even though the debtors, the Board and Commonwealth government all believe these claims are best resolved outside of the Title III court process and through the Commonwealth's existing processes.

Many of the claims that were filed that fall under these rubrics of pension and employment claims are not even for amounts due and owing, but are instead claims simply preserving or stating that folks have a pension. And those types of claims are being dealt with through the letter writing process and the objection process, to the extent they don't assert an amount due and owing. But to the extent they do, we prefer to, and believe it's more appropriate to resolve them through the Commonwealth's existing processes.

But as a result of this influx of claims --

THE COURT: So just as an example, where you had people who just said, "I have a pension," you asked them for further information, they didn't provide it, and you've included them in the Omnibus claim objection, there would be no further action on that Proof of Claim? But if they really have a pension, they'll get a pension pursuant to the normal

administrative procedures?

MS. STAFFORD: Correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: But you wouldn't be necessarily objecting to their assertion in this administrative process?

MS. STAFFORD: So we would be objecting to an assertion that -- we would not object to the assertion that someone has a pension claim that needs to be resolved, to the extent that they have a concern regarding the scope of the pension liabilities or the calculation of their pensions. To the extent that they are simply asserting that they have a pension, we don't believe that it's necessary for the administrative processes to handle that claim necessarily in and of itself.

To the extent that someone has come forward and written "pension" on a proof of claim and no further information that would allow us to understand whether or not there's an administrative process that needs to be -- that needs to take place with respect to that claimant, we would place that claimant on an Omnibus Objection and have it resolved that way.

THE COURT: Thank you. So this administrative process is for people who say, I worked 25 years and, therefore, my pension should be X amount per month, but you're saying I only worked 20 years and my pension would be less, that sort of thing?

MS. STAFFORD: Correct.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. STAFFORD: But as a result of the large number of claims that have been filed, this Court's docket is burdened by thousands and potentially tens of thousands of claims that the debtors wish to pay in the ordinary course. The procedures currently before the Court provide a speedy and cost effective means of liquidating these claims using existing state level procedures.

As we've described at a high level in the motion, the Commonwealth has many different procedures available to it to evaluate these claims and determine how much is owed to the claimants. The debtors intend to identify claims that are either appropriate for or are already being resolved through existing administrative processes as described in the motion. And I'll just provide a brief summary of what the procedures are, because there were some changes between the original, and the subsequent one and the revised procedures that we submitted with the Reply.

The procedures provide a defined timetable by which the agency's processes should be completed, subject to either the parties' agreement to extend certain deadlines or to local law that specifically provides for a longer time frame. And that timetable was for an initial determination of the claim and preserves for claimants any rights that they may have to

appeal administrative determinations with respect to the amount of their claim.

Claimants will present their claims through these ordinary course processes, and the amount of their claims will be liquidated. And the debtors will make payments to those claimants in respect to their claims as they have been determined by these administrative processes. And again, the claimants will retain all their rights to proceed through these processes, including any rights to appeal any initial determinations that have been set.

Once the Commonwealth's administrative processes have set the amount for the claim, that liquidated amount will be paid in full and not subject to reduction under the Plan. And just to clarify one point from the original motion --

THE COURT: I'm sorry. It will be paid in full and will not be subject to reduction under the Plan?

MS. STAFFORD: Correct. Yes.

THE COURT: So is this for pension payments that would have come due prior to the confirmation of a plan?

MS. STAFFORD: I believe that's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And then would you -- this is a question I was going to ask you along the way, because there are classes, I think, 25 and 26 in the Plan dealing with pension claims writ broad and the reduction of certain amounts of

pension claims. So would it be your expectation that this process would say, this is the appropriate computation of your plan; it would pay the pension payments coming due before confirmation in full, but then future payments based on those computations would be subject to treatment under the classes and the plan as to payments going forward?

And I'm going to have lots of questions for you, so don't worry about the light.

MS. STAFFORD: That's my understanding. And I'll defer to Mr. Rosen if I'm misstating at all, but that's my understanding.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MS. STAFFORD: And so to clarify one additional point in the motion, although the original motion stated the grievance claims would be subject to treatment under the Plan of Adjustment, we wanted to clarify for the record that the grievance claims, like the other claims addressed in the motion, will be paid in full and will be treated the same as the other three types of claims.

We're happy to submit any revised proposed orders that the Court might require to make that clear.

THE COURT: And so can you just tell me what is classified as a grievance claim? Because it seems odd to me that there are only 15 of them when, you know, there are hundreds of thousands of employees of the Commonwealth.

Ms. STAFFORD: I think the challenge is understanding what -- which of the claims that we have received to date are, in fact, grievance claims. We are intending those to be employee claims that were filed by unionized employees seeking -- asserting grievances under their CBAs, but there's a challenge for us to understand sometimes exactly what those claims -- which claimants that we have proofs of claim for are asserting grievances as opposed to other types.

THE COURT: And so it may be that some of the things you've put in other buckets in terms of the counts are really grievance claims, and it might also be that there are claims of this type where people read the bar date notice and didn't file a claim at all?

MS. STAFFORD: Correct, Your Honor. And to ensure that the Court and the debtors are able to monitor the progress of these claims, just to wrap up description of the procedures, the procedures further contemplate marking claims that are undergoing administrative reconciliation as subject to administrative reconciliation in the registry. So it's appropriate for the Court to abstain from resolving these claims itself and instead permit the debtors to proceed using the procedures just described.

And, in fact, all of the relevant abstention factors weigh in favor of allowing the liquidation of the claims through these Commonwealth administrative processes. The

efficient administration of the case will be greatly enhanced because administrative reconciliation will reduce the number of claims that need to be resolved by the Court.

And, in fact, if the Court has to resolve all of these claims itself, it will be forced to evaluate and liquidate claims according to existing Commonwealth law governing employee benefits, tax refunds and other types of administrative procedures. In effect, the Court will be duplicating the work that's already being performed by thousands of well-trained Commonwealth employees who are familiar with and very capable of administering the administrative processes that they already administer on a day-to-day basis. Administrative reconciliation also reduces reconciliation on the Court's docket, and on the debtors and the Court as it will result in fewer filings and hearings held with respect to these claims.

In determining the appropriate liquidated amount for these claims, also state law issues are sure to predominate over bankruptcy issues, given that the liquidation of these claims will be largely determined by the state law administrative processes. And in many, if not all, instances, there are related proceedings currently pending in state court. And those state proceedings are severable from the Title III cases because they address issues that are distinct from the bankruptcy issues this Court deals with on a daily

basis.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Only the UCC has objected to the relief sought by the motion, and importantly, the UCC supports the overall goal of providing a speedy and cost effective resolution of these claims using the existing Commonwealth processes. The only modification the UCC seeks is the addition of a provision that permits claimants to file a motion requesting their claims be transferred back to the Title III Court for allowance or payment in the event they're not paid in a timely fashion. But that really undercuts one of the key benefits of this process, which is allowing the administrative procedures to handle claims that they are best positioned to handle and permitting claimants to seek allowance or payment of their claim before the Court will force the Court to do and duplicate the work that the Commonwealth is already doing. So since that's precisely what the motion seeks to avoid, we'd ask that the additional proposal provided by the UCC not be included in any procedures the Court might be inclined to enter. If Your Honor has further questions, I'm happy to answer them. THE COURT: I do.

MS. STAFFORD: I figured as much.

THE COURT: I do. Thank you for that presentation which did cover a number of the questions that I have. I'm

trying to make sure that I have an accurate picture of how the claims targeted by this process relate to the universe of claims.

So first, the motion refers to "extraordinary claims," claims, "related to prior litigations," a particular claim by Doral Financial Corporation, workers' compensation cases, and collective bargaining matters that apparently might otherwise fall under one of the four categories but which the debtors don't intend to put into the ACR process.

So, first of all -- well, what's the Doral claim?

What do you intend to do with the other things? And are there any other types or categories of claims that one would assume would be covered by this, but won't be?

MS. STAFFORD: I see that Mr. Rosen is here to address at least the Doral claims, so I'll let him.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. ROSEN: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you very much.

With respect to the Doral claims, this has been the subject of years of litigation that have gone up and down the Commonwealth court system, both in the Court of First Instance, as well as to the Puerto Rico Supreme Court on several bases. One with respect to something referred to as the closing agreements, that was also then the subject of the Doral bankruptcy case in the Southern District of New York, as well as a tax refund claim.

We have been discussing these issues not only with the Commonwealth, but also with counsel for Doral, and we are hopeful for resolving them. Because of the years' worth of litigation, however, we did not think it was appropriate to include those in the ACR process, and we are looking to deal with that externally and, if necessary, pursuant to a separate objection that would be filed, or an individual objection that would be filed before Your Honor.

But based upon discussions, I'm actually hopeful that we'll be reaching some degree of closure with respect to Doral. As Mr. Despins knows, Doral is one of the members of his Creditors Committee, and we have been working very, very closely with them.

THE COURT: Thank you.

And as to what extraordinary claims and prior litigation are and what you're going to do about workers' comp and collective bargaining matters?

MS. STAFFORD: Sure. With respect to other types of extraordinary claims along the lines of the Doral claim, I don't know of any standing here today, but to the extent there were any, we would potentially exempt them from the process, to the extent they present some of the same issues the Doral claim presents.

With respect to workers' comp and prior litigations, the goal would be to handle those through the ordinary --

either the ordinary claim objection process or an ADR process. And the same goes for workman's compensation claims and claims under the CBAs that would be dealt with through other procedures and not necessarily sent through these ACR processes.

These processes are really designed to allow the Commonwealth's administrative processes to function in the way that they ordinarily are and resolve claims through the ordinary course processes that the Commonwealth has set up.

THE COURT: So there's not a Workers' Comp

Administration in the Commonwealth that deals with workers'

comp claims as an ordinary matter?

MS. STAFFORD: I don't know whether or not there is such an administrative process, but the goal would be to have those types of claims, which are often in the nature of litigation claims, resolved through either objections or ADR at this stage.

THE COURT: Thank you. Next question. Paragraph ten of the motion states that many ACR claims have been pending and unresolved for over two years. So were all of these processes that are described in the proposed procedures frozen when the Title III petitions were filed?

MS. STAFFORD: I don't believe that all have been. I believe that at least some tax refund claims have been paid.

But certainly some have been and have not been proceeding in

the ordinary course, and Mr. Rosen may want to add more to that.

THE COURT: Mr. Rosen.

MR. ROSEN: Because of the financial situation of the Commonwealth, many of these things were placed on hold. It is our understanding that most, if not substantially all of the tax refund claims at this point have actually been administratively handled and perhaps even all have been paid. But the goal of the ACR process is to actually jump start all of those claims processes that were sort of stuck in limbo for a period of time.

And we've been working with the Commonwealth, and the reason that this motion took so long to get together was to come up with a mechanism to make sure that the Commonwealth could be responsive in a timely fashion to not only the claimants themselves, but also to the Court. And to give the Court comfort that these claims, if we were, in fact, to remove them from the claims registry, were not just going to sit in limbo for another two to three years, but actually would be handled expeditiously. And that we would be then responding back to the Court, letting the Court know that these claims have actually been addressed and the claimants have been taken care of.

THE COURT: And so your belief is that there are sufficient operating mechanisms that are sufficiently staffed

to be able to deliver on the timetables in the proposal for processing through those administrative procedures, even if they haven't been working, or working efficiently over the past two years?

MR. ROSEN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So the lift stay provision of the procedures refers exclusively to, quote, the continuation of claims subject to administrative processes. So do you anticipate that everything that's going to be dealt with in this process has already been commenced in some way as to each and every one of the ACR claims?

MR. ROSEN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And as to routine claims that you say have already been satisfied, and I'm referring to paragraph ten of the motion, are you planning at some point to commence motion practice to clean up the claims register?

MR. ROSEN: Ms. Stafford, Laura, I'll defer to you.

MS. STAFFORD: Sure. I think, at this stage, we would intend them to be marked as subject to administrative reconciliation on the Title III registry, and we would allow them to be handled through that, subject to administrative reconciliation designation on the register.

THE COURT: And so one of my questions down the road was going to be, at the end of all of this, when you have resolved a lot of things through the administrative process,

you're not planning to have something that will put on the claims register the closing note that they've been resolved?

MS. STAFFORD: So the ACR status notices that the procedures contemplate would permit the Court to be informed about the fact that certain claims have been resolved through the administrative processes, either prior to or during the course of the administrative reconciliation, after hopefully the procedures are entered. And that I think -- I would be happy for that to include some means of noting on the register that those have been resolved, perhaps allowing the ACR status notice to permit a changing of the designation of the claim on the registry to indicate that it's been resolved.

THE COURT: I would encourage you to do something that would make the paperwork map back to itself and be more transparent. And I would be really excited about something that would involve a direction to Prime Clerk, which maintains the claims registry, to do whatever updating on that claims registry may be necessary.

MS. STAFFORD: We would be happy for the ACR status notice to include something along those lines that would permit that direction to Prime Clerk.

THE COURT: Terrific.

Paragraph 11 of the motion refers to additional claims that you anticipate you'll identify. Now, are those claims that are included in the 161,0000 claim count, or would

those be ones that you're aware of that haven't been filed already?

MS. STAFFORD: Those -- those refer to claims for which -- that currently do not provide us with any detail. Claims that are currently filed, part of the 170 or 180,000 that are currently pending, as to which we sent out the proposed mail -- the mailings in accordance with the Court's Order over the summer. And to the extent we receive information back from those claimants indicating that they have an ongoing administrative process, we would expect those claims to be sent over into the administrative reconciliation processes.

The numbers that we provided in the motion are sort of necessarily approximate because we don't have enough information on the faces of the claims themselves to know which ones are really appropriate for and should go through these procedures as opposed to being resolved in some other way.

THE COURT: Do you anticipate some substantial volume of traffic of these types of claims for which people didn't file a Proof of Claim here?

I'm trying to get a sense of the magnitude of the hit on these administrative processes that we can expect, and some representation or assurance that you've really worked through with the government and the effective agencies the mechanics

of this, to the extent that you have a confidence that you can share with me today that the processes will be able to handle this volume of claims at the pace contemplated here.

MS. STAFFORD: We did work closely with the Commonwealth government when we designed the process and created the timetables that are presented in the motion. And one of the things that we did was extend the time frames to make sure that there would be enough -- between the original motion and the revised motion, to make sure that there would be enough time.

It's difficult for us to say how many claims may be out there for which no proofs of claim were filed of course, but we do understand and we've worked with the Commonwealth government in order to ensure that the time frames are appropriate. And of course we — the procedures themselves also contemplate potentially longer periods of time, to the extent necessary or agreed to by the parties or required under local law.

THE COURT: So the procedures refer to resolution of a claim. What do you mean by resolved?

MS. STAFFORD: So our understanding of resolved would be that there would be a determination made, a final determination as to the amount of the claim, the liquidation of the claim.

THE COURT: Okay. Or rejection of the claim

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

entirely? MS. STAFFORD: Correct, to the extent that the determination is that there is no amount due and owing. MR. ROSEN: Your Honor, taking your example of earlier, someone said they had a pension obligation of X dollars versus Y dollars, and it would be the reconciliation of that. And if the parties still disagreed, then they would go through the appellate administrative processes, though. But it would be a fully liquidated claim as far as the Commonwealth was concerned. THE COURT: And so at the end of whatever administrative and appellate processes are invoked, whatever that final resolution would be, would be the final resolution of that claim against the debtor? MS. STAFFORD: Correct. MR. ROSEN: Your Honor, that's correct. THE COURT: Okay. And in paragraph 31 of the motion, and throughout, you talk about claims being paid once they're liquidated in the ordinary course. And how long does the ordinary course typically take? MS. STAFFORD: I think that can vary, Your Honor, depending on the administrative process that we're referring to. So I'm not comfortable necessarily giving a clear exact number of days because I think it can depend.

THE COURT: Let's talk about orders of magnitude.

You know, could the ordinary course be between like one and three years, or are we talking about two to six months, or something in between?

MS. STAFFORD: I do think it varies enough that I'm not sure. And I can provide additional information if the Court would prefer.

THE COURT: It would be helpful to have more concrete information about that. And just to preview a couple of the things that I'm thinking about in connection with this motion practice, is that I think an even more detailed regular reporting system would be helpful, including a category for claims that have been resolved but not yet paid, so that we can see how that's trailing. And to the extent that I need to be able to assess and hear any argument or comments on whether this process is working as advertised, we can take into account that issue as well.

MS. STAFFORD: Of course.

MR. ROSEN: Your Honor, our goal here was transparency throughout the process and to keep you comfortable that it was moving forward. And we believe that the transparency itself will also help the Commonwealth continue to do things in the time frame that everybody wants it to do it, including the payment of the claims. So we're okay with that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: That's great. It sounds like we're on

the same page. 2 MR. ROSEN: Absolutely. THE COURT: Great. So bear with me for a few more 3 4 questions. Paragraph 12 refers to claims related to the 5 6 entitlement of quantification of benefits. Am I correct in 7 assuming that you meant to say entitlement or quantification of benefits? And if not, what's entitlement of 8 quantification? 9 MS. STAFFORD: That's correct, Your Honor, 10 11 entitlement or qualification. 12 THE COURT: Okay. Great. Let's see. Your motion contemplates the submission 13 of pension and retiree claims, quote, to ERS or any successor 14 thereto. Is ERS still in business for pension administration? 15 16 MS. STAFFORD: I believe so, at this time, Your Honor. 17 THE COURT: And so at this time, it's the expectation 18 that ERS would be the entity processing the claims? 19 MS. STAFFORD: Correct, Your Honor. 20 THE COURT: Okay. And there are a couple of 21 differences in the summaries of the existing processes. 22 instance, for pension and retiree claims, you list the Court 23 of Appeals as the venue for judicial review. So is that the 24 first and final level of judicial review for those sorts of 25

1 claims? 2 MS. STAFFORD: I believe that's correct, Your 3 Honor. THE COURT: Whereas tax claims, I think, can go to 4 5 the Supreme Court as well? 6 MS. STAFFORD: I believe that's correct. I'm happy 7 to confirm and clarify. THE COURT: I think before a notice goes out, we 8 should make sure that the descriptions of things are accurate 9 so that everybody can understand. 10 Bear with me for a moment. 11 So paragraph 21 of the motion indicates that claims 12 for wages, vacation time and sick leave will be included in 13 this process. Can you tell me how the administrative 14 processing aspect of that relates to the legal challenges that 15 16 we've seen to the changes in timing and payment provisions for vacation and sick pay under Acts 66-2014, 3-2017, 26-2017, et 17 cetera? 18 Is there some separate classification or pathway that 19 you're anticipating for dealing with a claim that, yes, I have 20 21 that money, but I can't have it now, or I can't have it in the 22 way that I expected to? MS. STAFFORD: Well, I think the administrative 23 24 processes would apply the law as it is -- as they ordinarily So in accordance with whatever procedures and whatever 25 would.

laws are applicable to the claim at the time that it would have accrued for that claimant.

THE COURT: And so to the extent there is some claim brought by the union or otherwise as to the value of the differential as a takings claim or something else, that would be dealt with elsewhere in the Title III or plan classification process?

MS. STAFFORD: Correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: As to public employee claims, and specifically some of the types of claims enumerated in paragraph 21 of the motion, the motion indicates that the Court of First Instance and an Office of Mediation and Adjudication within the Department of Labor have concurrent jurisdiction of those claims.

So with this ACR motion, is the debtor contemplating relief from stay to let a claimant go either route or only the administrative route?

MS. STAFFORD: I would contemplate either route.

THE COURT: This is a small technical point, but one important to me. On -- you have two ways of channeling claims into this. One is the notice that sends things in bulk, and then you have the option of designating something if there's an objection to a claim and a response.

The proposed timing on that latter type of designation is ten days after the claimant's response has been

filed, which I think would come after the ordinary reply deadline and coincide with the Omni. And so I'm concerned about the claimant's ability to know that they're not going to be taken up at the Omni, and even more important to me, my ability to know what I need to prepare for to deal with at the Omni.

And so how would you feel about accelerating that notice, at least to match up with what would otherwise be your reply deadline, or working the deadline in some other way that lets everybody be efficient and knowledgeable?

MS. STAFFORD: That's perfectly fine. And I think it would be ideal for us to be able to have that deadline be the same date as the reply date for all claimants so that we don't have to -- we receive responses at different times, and it would be helpful -- if it's clear that it's the same as the reply date, then that will help us make sure that we're all administratively clear about what needs to be taken up at the Omni and what can be moved into -- to the administrative processes.

THE COURT: Okay. Great. So if you can put that on your list for further clarification.

MS. STAFFORD: Sure. Yes.

THE COURT: And would you have any problem with providing, along with the notice that encapsulates the procedures and tells the person that they're going into this

administrative claims reconciliation process, a high-level summary of the levels of administrative processing and potential review of, you know, appeals of decisions that would apply to that category of claims, and particularly where there are timing deadlines within that administrative process, in order to promote transparency and make sure that people know how they're supposed to channel their attentions within their classification?

MS. STAFFORD: I'd be happy to include something like that in the notice. I would want to make sure that it's clear that there are a number of different processes and the timing may vary depending on the process, but I'm happy to have a nice, transparent notice that explains what will happen next.

THE COURT: That's great. I think that will be helpful all around.

So before I hear from Mr. Despins, just to kind of summarize high level about my inclination at this point, subject to hearing from Mr. Despins, is that I am inclined to approve the procedures. I reserve the right -- since we haven't seen them operative on the ground, instead of giving you a complete and final path into whatever happens with these, I expect robust reporting. And I reserve the right to modify, rescind, extend, whatever needs to be done, in whole or in part, the procedures as I may find necessary, in the

course of events, in order to make sure that we're all still consistent with going at the goals that I think we all embrace, and adding a couple of aspects to the reporting and to the initial notice to the claimant.

MS. STAFFORD: Great. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Despins.

MR. DESPINS: I think this will be short. If I understood you correctly, you would keep jurisdiction to modify this or undo it if you find that it doesn't -- meaning it's not as advertised?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. DESPINS: Okay. So that -- can a claimant come to Your Honor and complain about, for example, not getting paid or not having their claim administered? I think we're on the same wavelength. We don't want the Court to be burdened with these claims. Let's be clear about that. We're just concerned about is it as advertised.

The experience has been it's not as advertised.

Let's be clear about that. There's 2,200 tax refund folks that filed claims. The government viewed that as a source of financing when they ran short of cash. They didn't pay the tax refunds. That's why we're here and raising this issue.

But if Your Honor keeps jurisdiction over that, and there's a mechanism for either us or a claimant to say, this is not

working as advertised, then we can agree on some language in the order that says that or -- that's it.

THE COURT: Okay. I am not anticipating being welcoming to claimants popping up here and there and saying, it's 45 days and I haven't gotten my check. That wouldn't be efficient from anybody's perspective. I am certainly anticipating being able to say at the Court's own instance, or in response to a motion, or informative notice or a request for a conference by the Committee or by some organized representative of claimants that there's a problem, this is bogging down and we ought to look at it again.

So I wasn't planning to specifically design that sort of back end process in the language of this Order, but the Order would say that the Court reserves the right to -- let me see. I'm just -- I can kind of tell you what I have in mind if you give me a chance to find my notes on it. Just a moment.

The Court would reserve the right to modify or rescind, in whole or in part, these procedures in the event the Court determines that such a step is necessary in the interest of justice and efficient resolution of the types of claims covered by the proposal.

And so if it becomes apparent that there are problems in some part or the whole of the process, we can, A, you let me know, and then we'll figure out how best to handle it.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. DESPINS: I think that's the only way that it can work from a due process view because these claimants did not get notice of this motion. So if that language is in there, and I think the understanding is we can raise it with the Court if it doesn't work -- we are not interested in having hair triggers here where 45 days, we are looking for something where it's obvious that people have been -- their claim's allowed and they're not getting paid for 90 days, 120 days, or something that shocks the conscience, whatever that is. That's all. THE COURT: And Ms. Stafford is going to try to generate a little bit more information about how these things go in order to manage expectations. Thank you, Your Honor. MR. DESPINS: Ms. Stafford, anything -- I'm sorry, sir. THE COURT: MR. BARRIOS RAMOS: Your Honor, good afternoon -good morning. Jose Luis Barrios in representation of American Federation of Teachers and Asociacion de Maestros de Puerto Rico. And very briefly --THE COURT: Good morning. MR. BARRIOS RAMOS: Good morning. Counsel already explained that in regard to the grievance claims, they -- the debtor is willing to propose new language than the -- originally stated in the motion. regarding that the grievance claims, just like other employee

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

claims, will be paid in the ordinary course instead of the treatment under the Plan, and we just wanted to reaffirm that agreement we have with the Oversight Board. THE COURT: Thank you. Ms. Stafford, just by nodding, will you confirm that that is the agreement? (Nodding head up and down.) MS. STAFFORD: Yes. THE COURT: I have an affirmative nod from Ms. Stafford. MR. BARRIOS RAMOS: Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you. Did anyone else wish to be heard on this? Ms. Stafford, any reply remarks that you wish me to hear? MS. STAFFORD: (Shaking head from side to side.) don't think so, Your Honor. There was a negative nod from THE COURT: Ms. Stafford on that one. And so I will now make my ruling, which includes some instructions as to follow-up documentation. Before the Court is the Motion for Entry of an Order, A, authorizing administrative reconciliation of certain claims; B, approving additional form of notice; and C, granting related relief, which is docket entry number 8827 in

case 17-3283, and I'll refer to that as the Motion.

It was filed by the Oversight Board on behalf of the Commonwealth, HTA, ERS, PREPA and PBA, which I'll refer to collectively as the debtors. And I've reviewed the motion and the papers filed in opposition and reply in respect thereof.

The Motion seeks the implementation of procedures for resolution of certain types of claims, namely public employee claims for pension or retiree benefits, claims for tax refunds, claims for salaries and benefits owed to public employees, and union grievances, for which there are already existing administrative procedures within the Commonwealth agencies and the court system.

I'll refer to the proposal as the proposed procedures, and to the categories of claims by the nomenclature used in the Motion, which is pension/retiree claims, tax refund claims, public employee claims and grievance claims respectively. And collectively I'll refer to the claims as the ACR claims.

For the following reasons, and subject to the modifications that I'll detail in the course of this oral decision, the motion is granted.

In support of the Motion, the Oversight Board argues that the proposed procedure should be adopted and implemented under the authority granted by Title 11 of the *United States*Code, Section 105, as consistent with the principles animating

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the claims dispute resolution provisions of Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3007. And as appropriate under the doctrine of permissive abstention pursuant to Title 28 of the United States Code, Section 1334(c)(1), which provides that a Federal Court may, in the interest of justice, or in the interest of comity with state courts or with respect to state law, abstain from hearing a particular proceeding arising under Title 11, or arising in or related to a case under Title 11.

In evaluating whether to apply the doctrine of permissive abstention, courts may consider: One, the effect on the efficient administration of the estate; two, the extent to which state law issues predominate over bankruptcy issues; three, the difficulties or unsettled nature of the applicable law; four, the presence of a related proceeding in state court; five, the jurisdictional basis, if any, other than Title 28, Section 1334; six, the relatedness of the proceeding to the main bankruptcy case; seven, the substance and not the form of the alleged core proceeding; eight, the feasibility of severing state law issues from bankruptcy matters; nine, the burden on the docket of the bankruptcy court; ten, the likelihood that commencement of bankruptcy proceedings amounted to forum shopping; 11, the existence of a right to jury trial; and 12, the presence in the proceeding of nondebtor parties.

I was quoting from the *In Re Unanue-Casal* case.

That's U-n-a-n-u-e, hyphen, C-a-s-a-l. 164 B.R. 216 at 222, a

1993, District of Puerto Rico decision.

Having considered the proposal and the parties' arguments thoroughly, the Court concludes that the factors relevant to the question of permissive abstention weigh at this juncture in favor of abstention, permitting the relevant Commonwealth agencies and courts to address the issues of validity and liquidation of these four categories of claims.

Based on the debtors' representations regarding the features and capabilities of the Commonwealth's mechanisms for administrative claims resolution, the Court finds that implementation of the proposed procedures would likely improve the efficient administration of the estate, or of the debtors' assets, and relieve a substantial burden on the docket of the Title III Court. In addition, with respect to most, if not all, ACR claims, state law issues predominate over bankruptcy issues. And similarly, based on the debtors' representations, many of the ACR claims are already the subject of ongoing Commonwealth proceedings.

The Court is also satisfied that particularly in light of the judicial review processes described in the motion and further clarified on the record today, the proposed procedures meet the requirement of procedural due process.

Nevertheless, because these administrative mechanisms appear

to have been dormant for some time and have not been tested in the context of these massive Title III proceedings, the Court is not willing to make its approval irrevocable and completely open-ended.

A more particularized reporting format will be required, and the Court will reserve the right to modify or rescind, in whole or in part, these procedures in the event the Court determines that such a step is necessary in the interest of justice and efficient resolution of the types of claims covered by the proposal. In other words, the Court will be keeping a close eye on whether the debtors can deliver on the representations made in connection with this motion practice, and will make changes if the process bogs down.

To provide a more precise window into processing of the claims, the debtors are directed to amend the reporting aspect of the procedures, which is paragraph four of that summary, to provide that the initial and periodic reports must include, A, information as to claims that have not been restarted or initiated within 60 days of the ACR notice; B, information as to the phase, for example, pending initial determination or a pending appeal to the Court of Appeals, in which each unresolved claim that has been pending for more than 90 days has been reached; and C, information as to claims that have been resolved in favor of the claimant for which payment has not been made within — at this point I'll say 60

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

days of favorable termination, but Ms. Stafford, as you give us more information, if you want to propose a longer period that is more realistic, let's have a realistic period. MS. STAFFORD: Okay. THE COURT: The Order must also be amended to include the reservation of the Court's rights that I recited a few minutes ago. And in addition, in order to provide the claimants with information regarding the relevant administrative and judicial avenues of review, the ADR notice must include a summary of the stages and any applicable time limits for the category of ACR claim into which the creditor's claim has been classified. I'd like to have the revised proposed materials filed on presentment in two weeks, by November 13th. Is that feasible, Ms. Stafford? MS. STAFFORD: (Nodding head up and down.) Yes. THE COURT: Very well. Thank you very much. That is my decision on this matter. And thank you for the work that's gone into development of this procedure and the work that's gone into the assurances provided today that it should work. So that concludes the Agenda for things to be heard There are adjourned matters listed at Item V of the today. Agenda. Is there anyone else who wants to be heard on anything today?

1 (No response.) Seeing no one jump up, the next scheduled 2 THE COURT: hearing date is the hearing in connection with the 3 4 Gracia-Gracia Lift Stay Motion, which is scheduled for November 14, 2019, in New York, with a video connection to San 5 Juan. And the next scheduled Omnibus hearing is December 11, 6 7 2019, here in San Juan, with video connection to New York. As always, I thank the court staff here in Puerto 8 Rico, the staff in Boston and New York for their work in 9 preparing for and conducting today's hearing, and their 10 11 absolutely superb, ongoing support of the administration of these very important and complex cases. 12 Thank you all. Keep well, and safe travels. We are 13 adjourned. 14 (At 11:31 AM, proceedings concluded.) 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

```
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
     DISTRICT OF PUERTO RICO)
2
 3
          I certify that this transcript consisting of 84 pages is
 4
     a true and accurate transcription to the best of my ability of
 5
     the proceedings in this case before the Honorable United
 6
7
     States District Court Judge Laura Taylor Swain on October 30,
     2019.
8
 9
10
11
12
     S/ Amy Walker
     Amy Walker, CSR 3799
13
     Official Court Reporter
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

< Dates >	10:30. 33:2, 41:13	
August 2018 42:19,	10th 28:10	< 3 >
43:10	11 64:23, 78:24,	3-2017 70:17
December 11, 2019	79:8, 79:23	3007. 79:2
83:6	11. 79:9	305 51:2
December 31, 2019	11:31 83:15	30th 27:24
6:16	11th 40:13	31 67:17
January 2018 22 : 2	12 69:5, 79:24	31833. 48:13
July 2017 42:12,	120 76:8	35 5:21
43:2, 43:4	12:00 5:4	3799 84:13
June 13 8:19	1334 79:17	3: 1:6
June 2018 43:9	1334(c)(1 79:4	
May 2018 42:17,	13th 82:14	
43:2, 43:5	15 8:17, 55:24	< 4 >
November 14, 2019	150 8:17	4. 33:1
83:5	16,000 13:11	45 75:5, 76:6
October 11, 2019	161,0000 64:25	45,606 43:1
30:17	16312. 45:16	
October 18 27:25	164 80:2	
October 1st 23:19	17-3283 78:1	< 5 >
October 22, 2019	17-BK-3283(LTS 1:6	5 32:24, 50:3
9:14	170 65:5	50 17:25
October 25 28:15 October 28 6:14	171656. 33:19 180,000 65:5	55 5:22 56 28:17, 28:19,
October 20 0:14 October 30, 2019	18335 43:4	45:7
1:16, 4:2, 84:7	18335. 42:9	57 29:1, 29:9
October 9th 34:12	18835 44:14	5:00 5:5
September 11, 2019	19.9 10:19	3.00 3.3
41:1	1993 80:3	
September 27 27:17,	1:00 5:4	< 6 >
44:1, 44:5		60 81:19, 81:25
September 27th 5:17,		64th 33:5, 33:8,
43:19	< 2 >	34:25, 40:19,
September 27th, 2019	2,200 74:20	41:5, 41:7
44:21	20 52:24	66-2014 70:17
\$25,000. 40:3	2018 42:22	69th 41:18, 41:19,
\$25,219.50 34:22	2018. 42:12, 42:22	44:11, 44:15,
\$45,606 42:11	2019 40:13	44:16, 44:19,
\$5,000 14:8	2019. 27:24, 42:19	44:22
\$62,190 42:25	2020. 9:4	
	204(a 29:2, 29:4	
	21 70:12, 71:11	< 7 >
< 1 >	216 80:2	7 2:22
1.5 10:20	21: 1:41	72nd 41:15, 45:1,
10.2 10:23	222 80:2	45:3, 47:4, 47:15,
100,000 13:4	25 52:22, 54:24	47:18
105 78:25	26 54:24	73rd 47:21, 47:25,
1091-2 35:9, 35:11	26-2017 70:17	48:15, 49:10,
10:30 5:6, 32:17, 32:25	28 79:3, 79:17	49:16, 49:24, 49:25
J		49.43

74 48:4	accept 23:9, 36:20	58:17, 64:23,
	accomplish 26:3,	68:5, 77:24
< 8 >	30:16	Additionally 47:10 address 19:17,
8.2 10:21	accordance 51:3, 65:7, 70:25	19:19, 26:13,
80 18:1	according 57:6	30:4, 33:23, 46:4,
84 84:4	accordingly 48:25	57:24, 59:15, 80:8
8695 42:5	account 27:25, 37:7,	addressed 30:6,
8698 45:6	68:16	45:24, 48:6,
8699. 48:3	accounts 27:24	55:17, 62:22
8780. 42:8	accrued 8:18, 71:2	addresses 5:21,
8812 45:15	accurate 25:6, 59:1,	19:21, 19:23,
8827 77 : 25	70:9, 84:5	48:13
8855 48:12	achievements 6:13	adjourned 33:12,
	acknowledge 14:22	82:22, 83:14
	ACR 50:4, 50:8,	Adjudication 71:13
< 9 >	59:9, 60:5, 61:4,	Adjustment 5:18,
90 76:8, 81:23	61:19, 62:9,	6:9, 27:15, 31:18,
9019 49:13	63:11, 64:3,	45:20, 48:19,
9:30 4:3, 5:4	64:10, 64:19,	55:16
	71:15, 78:18,	administer 57:12
. 7	80:17, 80:19,	Administered 1:11,
< A > A. 2:6, 49:21	81:19, 82:11 Act 29:19, 30:21	74:15 administering 57:11
A. 2:0, 49:21 AAFAF 7:3, 7:23,	action 37:5, 37:15,	Administration
8:19, 8:20, 8:24,	51:24	28:24, 57:1,
9:20, 9:23, 9:25,	actions 28:18	61:11, 69:15,
23:20, 26:12,	active 6:10	79:12, 80:14,
26:23, 27:8,	activities 5:14,	83:11
27:15, 27:18,	5:16	administratively
27:22, 27:25,	Acts 70:17	62:8, 72:17
28:3, 29:9, 29:15,	actual 17:21, 37:6	adopted 78:23
29:18	actually 13:10,	ADR 7:15, 7:21,
Abdelmasieh 16:1,	14:15, 16:20,	7:24, 8:8, 8:12,
16:6, 20:7	30:3, 32:17,	8:13, 11:15,
ability 72:3, 72:5,	37:16, 60:9, 62:7,	13:15, 13:23,
84:5	62:9, 62:19, 62:22	13:25, 15:1, 20:5,
able 14:16, 15:16, 16:9, 19:11,	adapted 12:5 add 18:19, 24:7,	21:23, 21:25, 61:1, 61:16, 82:9
21:16, 35:21,	62:1	advertised 68:15,
36:25, 56:15,	adding 74:3	74:11, 74:18,
63:1, 66:2, 68:14,	addition 17:12,	74:19, 75:1
72:12, 75:7	29:1, 29:18, 58:6,	advisors 9:10, 32:9
Absolutely 16:11,	80:16, 82:7	Advisory 2:10
22:22, 69:2, 83:11	additional 7:10,	advocate 7:10
abstain 56:20, 79:7	11:8, 31:7, 33:14,	Affairs 28:24
abstention 56:23,	33:17, 34:9,	affect 44:20
79:3, 79:11, 80:6,	34:20, 38:18,	affirmative 77:9
80:7	39:20, 42:15,	afford 22:8
accelerating 72:7	43:9, 55:13,	AFSCME 6:4

afternoon 76:16	57:12, 58:15,	31:25, 58:21
agencies 27:12,	63:10, 63:14,	anticipate 15:16,
28:9, 28:20,	65:2, 76:22,	20:6, 63:9, 64:24,
29:12, 42:2, 42:3,	78:10, 80:19	65:19
42:15, 65:25,	Although 8:4, 11:4,	anticipated 8:15,
78:12, 80:8	55:14	9:22
Agency 2:9, 10:7,	Alvarez 16:22	anticipating 70:20,
28:12, 53:21	amend 34:18, 81:15	75:3 , 75:7
Agenda 5:5, 32:5,	Amended 33:18,	anxious 12:25
32:15, 32:24,	33:20, 33:22,	anybody 75:6
44:25, 47:23,	33:23, 34:11,	apparent 75:23
50:2, 50:3, 82:21,	34:15, 34:17,	apparently 59:7
82:23	36:15, 36:20,	appeal 54:1, 54:9,
agent 32:8	36:22, 37:24,	81:21
aggressive 15:10,	38:3, 38:5, 38:18,	Appeals 22:8, 69:24,
15:21	38:19, 39:14,	73:3, 81:21
ago 82:7	40:3, 40:16, 41:6,	appear 22:6, 80:25
agree 6:21, 38:3,	42:18, 43:11,	APPEARANCES 1:32,
75:1	43:18, 43:21,	2:1
agreed 66:17	44:6, 44:20,	Appearing 1:38, 2:12
Agreement 8:20, 9:1,	49:14, 82:5	appears 12:14
42:23, 42:24,	amending 35:8	appellate 67:8,
45:19, 53:22,	amendment 34:13	67:12
77:3, 77:6	amendments 11:1,	applicable 71:1,
agreements 30:24,	30:1	79:14, 82:10
59:23	American 76:17	applicants 30:22
ahead 12:13, 23:16,	among 9:5, 9:10,	apply 70:24, 73:4,
24:3	35:25	79:10
aid 10:6, 12:2	amount 8:16, 10:21,	appreciate 20:3
aided 27:22	13:17, 14:7,	appreciated 20:13
aim 9:2	18:24, 31:19,	approach 33:21
aimed 31:6	34:21, 35:6,	approaching 11:18
al 1:16, 1:35	35:19, 35:20,	appropriate 51:17,
Ali 27:10, 28:21	36:1, 42:10,	53:14, 55:2,
alleged 47:12,	51:16, 52:23,	56:20, 57:17,
49:12, 79:19	54:2, 54:4, 54:12,	60:4, 65:16,
allocated 10:2,	57:17, 66:23, 67:3	66:15, 79:2
10:19	amounted 79:23	approval 27:18,
allocation 12:14	amounts 43:7, 45:5,	28:4, 32:8, 50:8,
allow 30:22, 52:16,	48:2, 49:20,	81:3
61:6, 63:20	51:12, 54:25	approve 8:22, 46:6,
•		73:20
allowance 58:8,	Amy 84:12, 84:13	
58:13	analysis 27:23	approved 8:1
allowed 34:9, 76:8	and/or 25:10, 45:11,	approving 45:18,
allowing 20:21,	48:8	46:8, 77:24
50:10, 56:24,	Andrini 2:21	approximate 65:14
58:11, 64:10	animating 78:25	approximately 8:17,
almost 13:3	announced 30:19,	13:11, 14:8
already 4:17, 35:3,	31:5, 31:13	arbitration 12:3,
43:5, 53:14, 57:9,	answer 7:18, 18:16,	14:1, 14:5, 14:8,
	•	i

14 11 14 10	10.6	
14:11, 14:19,	assistance 10:6	76:17, 76:21,
14:23, 15:3,	associated 14:7,	77:11
15:20, 22:9,	14:18, 42:4, 47:6,	Based 11:24, 13:10,
22:11, 22:15	51:2	33:9, 35:18,
areas 10:3, 30:8	assume 26:5, 59:12	35:22, 35:24,
argued 37:13, 37:25	assuming 21:8, 69:7	36:15, 40:4,
argues 78:22	assurance 65:24	41:25, 47:8, 47:9,
argument 34:24,	assurances 82:20	47:12, 49:11,
35:4, 36:25, 37:2,	attached 17:9,	49:18, 55:4, 60:9,
38:4, 46:23, 49:9,	34:23, 35:7, 35:15	80:10, 80:18
68:14	attempt 8:9	bases 59:22
arguments 33:24,	attending 32:14	basically 37:5
46:5, 80:5	attentions 73:7	basically 37.3 basis 17:15, 17:21,
•		
arising 45:21,	attorneys 18:23	57:13, 58:1, 79:16
46:11, 48:14,	audible 4:18	Bear 14:12, 14:13,
48:22, 79:7, 79:8	AUST 1:41	69:3, 70:11
around 18:21, 26:21,	Authority 1:21,	becomes 75:23
73:16	2:11, 5:19, 51:1,	begin 5:8, 33:5
arrangement 25:11	78:24	begun 10:15, 17:18,
Arribas 1:41	authorization 10:22	27 : 10
articulate 38:23	authorizing 20:23,	behalf 20:18, 26:12,
aside 23:22	21:1, 77:23	34:6, 41:14, 44:7,
Asociacion 2:14,	available 10:20,	46:19, 49:5, 78:2
76:18	15:25, 53:11	behind 31:11
aspect 70:15, 81:16	avenues 82:9	belief 62:24
aspects 27:13, 74:3	avoid 58:17	believe 13:4, 13:10,
assert 39:3, 39:7,	aware 11:22, 12:9,	13:13, 13:24,
40:14, 41:25,	24:6, 42:20,	21:4, 25:25,
45:8, 45:9, 45:10,	45:18, 65:1	28:16, 34:3,
45:11, 45:16,	,	35:20, 38:8, 51:7,
45:23, 46:2,		51:17, 52:11,
46:13, 47:7, 47:8,	< B >	54:20, 61:23,
48:5, 48:6, 48:7,	back 4:9, 16:5,	61:24, 68:20,
48:8, 49:18, 51:16	16:14, 20:5, 22:1,	69:16, 70:2, 70:6
asserted 18:11,	27:6, 58:8, 62:21,	believes 43:8
39:5, 40:15,	64:14, 65:9, 75:13	belong 47:10
42:11, 43:3,	background 18:4,	benefits 17:14,
	42:10	
43:17, 48:13		17:16, 17:25,
asserting 18:9,	bank 27:24, 27:25	50:24, 50:25,
42:18, 45:4, 48:1,	Bankruptcy 2:19,	57:7, 58:10, 69:6,
52:10, 56:5, 56:8	57:19, 57:25,	69:8, 78:8, 78:9
assertion 39:11,	59:24, 79:2,	best 10:2, 27:18,
52:4, 52:6	79:13, 79:18,	29:15, 31:25,
assertions 48:24	79:20, 79:21,	33:20, 51:7,
asserts 42:13, 47:6,	79:22, 80:17	58:12, 75:25, 84:5
47:11, 48:15,	bar 18:20, 50:21,	better 8:6, 9:25
49:11	56:12	beyond 21:4
assess 68:14	bargaining 59:7,	Bienenstock 1:35,
assets 29:22, 80:15	60:17	5:9, 5:10, 5:11,
assist 18:25	BARRIOS 2:16, 76:16,	11:17, 11:19,

00.10 04.11	1 1	
23:12, 24:11,	bring 5:2, 12:9,	caused 30:24
24:20, 24:21,	14:25, 36:6,	Cbas 56:5, 61:3
26:8, 26:15,	37:15, 37:19	CDBRDR 10:8
26:20, 27:15,	brings 5:23	center 22:17
28:2, 29:24	broad 17:23, 54:25	Central 30:18
bigger 25:16	broaden 6:10	centralizes 28:17
billion 5:21, 5:22,	broader 21:7, 48:21	certain 18:24,
10:19, 10:20,	broadly 27:6	50:10, 50:22,
10:22, 10:23	brought 71:4	53:22, 54:25,
bills 29:12	buckets 56:10	64:5, 77:23, 78:7
binding 13:25, 14:5,	budget 9:16, 29:10	Certainly 44:2,
14:7, 14:10,	budgets 6:25, 28:14	44:4, 61:25, 75:6
14:19, 14:23,	building 6:8	certification 9:1,
15:19	Buildings 5:19	29:3
Bishop 30:9	bulk 71:21	certifications 29:3,
bit 12:11, 13:8,	burden 79:21, 80:15	29:7, 29:11
15:10, 15:18,	burdened 53:4, 74:16	certified 7:2, 28:13
18:4, 23:14,	business 14:23,	certify 84:4
32:16, 37:8,	69:15	cetera 21:3, 70:18
	09.15	chairman 9:7
38:22, 38:23,		
76:12	< C >	challenge 56:1, 56:6
bizarre 23:14	_	challenges 30:7,
Blame 22:18	C-a-s-a-l 80:2	70:15
bless 24:9	calculation 52:9	chance 46:25, 75:16
blocks 18:21	called 7:2	changes 26:25,
bogging 75:11	cap 21:6	53:17, 70:16,
bogs 81:13	capabilities 80:11	81:13
bond 18:9, 18:10,	capable 57:11	changing 12:22,
40:20	Capitol 7:5, 7:10	64:11
bondholder 45:4,	care 50:2, 62:23	channel 28:21, 73:7
48:1, 48:12	carefully 39:19,	channeling 71:20
bondholders 8:21,	44:10, 44:11,	Chapter 2:22, 6:4
31:7	46:22, 49:8	charge 14:17
bonds 8:16, 31:12,	carry 14:18	check 20:22, 75:5
31:23, 36:9, 38:7,	carved 50:20	check-up 30:1
38:11, 39:5, 39:7,	case 9:3, 9:20,	checks 42:24
39:11, 39:12,	18:12, 23:15,	chiefs 28:12
39:16, 39:24,	35:3, 37:17,	circumvent 36:25
45:10, 45:11,	49:20, 57:1,	claimant 17:17,
45:12, 45:17,	59:24, 78:1, 79:8,	18:4, 18:13,
47:12, 48:7, 48:8,	79:18, 80:1, 84:6	33:12, 33:15,
48:9, 48:14,	cases 12:5, 37:13,	38:17, 39:2, 39:4,
48:25, 49:12,	57:24, 59:7, 83:12	39:9, 39:16, 46:5,
49:18	cash 27:23, 74:22	52:18, 52:19,
#9:10 Boston 83:9	CAT 2:49	71:2, 71:16,
bottom 24:24	categories 45:9,	71:25, 72:3, 74:4,
branch 28:20, 29:21	48:6, 59:8, 59:12,	74:13, 74:25,
Brian 1:37, 7:16	78:14, 80:9	81:24
brief 42:10, 53:16	category 68:11,	Claimants 8:2, 13:4,
briefly 76:19	73:4, 82:11	19:2, 20:21,

21:24, 22:5, 22:13, 34:25, 37:14, 49:19,	48:7, 48:14, 48:23, 48:25, 49:12, 49:14,	comply 29:13 components 7:7, 15:1 comprehensive 32:2
53:13, 53:25,	49:15	computation 55:2
54:3, 54:6, 54:8, 56:7, 58:7, 58:13,	coincide 72:2 collaborate 6:23	computations 55:5 concern 10:25,
62:16, 62:22,	collection 31:17	25:18, 52:8
65:9, 72:13, 75:4, 75:10, 76:2, 82:8	collections 31:15	concerned 67:10, 72:2, 74:18
75:10, 76:2, 62:6 claiming 39:9	collective 59:7, 60:17	concerning 28:18,
clarification 72:21	collectively 78:4,	29:21
clarified 38:5, 40:5, 80:23	78:17 column 49:21	concerns 27:2 conclude 23:24
clarify 54:14,	comes 12:16	concluded. 83:15
55:13, 55:16, 70:7	comfort 62:17	concludes 11:13,
clarity 44:20 classes 54:24, 55:5	comfortable 19:12, 67:23, 68:20	80:5, 82:21 conclusively 36:21
classification	coming 19:7, 32:16,	concrete 19:10, 68:7
70:19, 71:7, 73:8 classified 55:23,	55:3 comity 79:6	concurrent 71:13 conducting 83:10
82:12	commence 9:3, 9:20,	conference 4:11,
clean 63:16	63:15	75:9
cleaner 25:4 cleaning 19:4	commenced 63:10 commencement 79:22	confidence 31:22, 66:1
clear 31:16, 55:21,	commentary 23:9	confirm 39:21, 70:7,
67:23, 72:15, 72:17, 73:10,	comments 25:5, 25:6, 26:6, 30:7, 68:14	77:5 confirmation 48:21,
74:17, 74:20	Commission 42:16	49:14, 54:19, 55:4
clearly 38:23, 40:3	committed 24:24	confirmed 31:18,
Clerk 64:16, 64:21 clip 24:3	Committee 2:5, 6:2, 14:4, 20:18,	39:22, 48:19 confirming 20:3,
close 32:16, 81:11	22:16, 30:10,	45:20, 46:10,
closely 9:23, 60:13, 66:4	60:12, 75:9 communicate 4:13	47:13 confiscation 5:1
closer 5:23	communicated 27:16	Congress 9:14,
closing 59:23, 64:2	communicates 9:7	10:20, 11:1, 11:5,
closure 60:10 CM/ECF 35:9	communicating 4:24 communication 9:9,	29:24 connection 12:4,
Coalition 6:5	9:13, 14:15, 31:2	13:8, 13:25,
Code 78:25, 79:4 COFINA 31:5, 31:7,	Comp 60:16, 60:24, 61:10, 61:12	27:22, 41:15, 68:9, 81:12, 83:3,
31:8, 31:11,	compensation 50:25,	83:5, 83:7
31:13, 31:17,	59:6, 61:2	conscience 76:9
31:18, 31:20, 31:22, 32:8, 35:3,	complain 74:14 complete 73:22	consensus 6:8, 27:20 consent 15:20
45:10, 45:16,	completed 53:21	consider 27:18,
45:19, 45:20, 45:22, 46:9,	completely 81:3 complex 12:4, 83:12	37:20, 79:11 consideration 33:12
46:10, 46:11,	Compliance 28:13,	considered 39:19,
47:12, 47:14,	29:2, 29:19	80:4

consistency 29:11	36:11, 36:14,	46:1, 82:11
consistent 4:10,	40:24, 41:9,	Creditors 2:6, 6:7,
39:25, 40:12,	43:19, 43:20,	14:3, 27:12, 60:12
74:2, 78:25	47:23, 47:24,	criteria 16:16
·		
consisting 84:4	50:5, 52:2, 53:1,	critical 10:10,
constant 9:9, 9:13	54:17, 54:20,	22:9, 30:11
constantly 7:3	56:14, 67:2,	criticism 23:10
Constitution 46:7	67:15, 67:16,	CSR 84:13
Constitutional 6:5	69:6, 69:10,	current 6:16, 19:19
constructive 9:13,	69:20, 70:2, 70:6,	currently 38:20,
22:24, 23:10	71:8, 77:7	53:7, 57:22, 65:4,
•		
consummated 25:11	corrected 49:21	65:5, 65:6
contact 20:6, 20:11	Corrections 10:1	CUSIP 18:10, 40:22
contemplate 56:17,	correctly 26:20,	
64:4, 66:16, 71:18	74:9	
contemplated 66:3	cost 6:20, 14:7,	< D >
contemplates 69:13	14:20, 15:20,	daily 57:25
contemplating 71:15	25:16, 25:17,	damage 30:24, 36:7
contested 32:23	30:20, 30:23,	damage 30:24, 30:7
		3
context 19:17, 81:2	53:8, 58:4	dark 15:19
continuation 63:7	costs 25:18	data 31:10
continue 6:23, 9:21,	Counsel 4:6, 32:13,	date 18:20, 22:2,
26:24, 30:23,	60:2, 76:22	50:21, 56:2,
68 : 22	count 64:25	56:12, 72:13,
Continued 2:1, 27:4,	counts 56:10	72:16, 83:3
27:10, 42:16	couple 20:25, 68:8,	day 16:8, 23:6, 30:2
· ·	=	
continues 6:6, 6:9,	69:21, 74:3	day-long 28:11
7:1, 7:10	course 19:14, 53:6,	day-to-day 57:13
continuing 6:14, 8:9	54:4, 61:9, 62:1,	days 67:24, 71:25,
contract 42:1	64:7, 66:12,	75:5, 76:6, 76:8,
control 22:18	66:15, 67:19,	81:19, 81:23, 82:1
conversations 16:3	67:20, 68:1,	de 2:14, 2:15,
conversion 25:3	68:17, 74:1, 77:1,	14:19, 76:18
cooperate 9:21	78:20	deadline 6:15,
cooperated 9:20	courtroom 4:13,	30:20, 72:2, 72:9,
_		
coordinate 15:23,	4:24, 5:2, 7:17,	72:12
28:24	13:8, 16:22	deadlines 53:22,
coordinated 27:16	Courts 7:21, 8:11,	73 : 5
coordination 29:15,	79:6, 79:11, 80:8	deal 12:6, 12:7,
31:2	cover 43:1, 43:4,	12:14, 24:15,
COR3 30:18	58 : 25	60:5, 72:5
core 79:19	covered 40:22,	dealing 21:24,
corporate 31:9	43:11, 59:13,	54:24, 70:20
Corporation 31:12,	75:22, 81:10	deals 6:1, 36:21,
-	·	
41:14, 42:8, 44:8,	covers 32:7, 36:4,	57:25, 61:11
44:12, 44:19, 59:6	41:7	dealt 51:14, 61:3,
corporations 28:20	created 66:6	63:9, 71:6
Correct 19:13,	Credit 11:11, 31:11,	Debt 5:21, 6:5, 7:8,
19:25, 20:1,	31:12	25:1 , 27:13
21:12, 36:10,	creditor 5:25, 6:7,	debtor 34:13, 37:1,
·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	,

37:13, 37:16,	descriptions 70:9	69:22
37:21, 39:24,	design 75:12	different 23:11,
47:9, 67:14,	designating 71:22	37:8, 37:25,
71:15, 76:23	designation 63:22,	53:11, 72:14,
Debtors 1:23, 5:22,	64:11, 71:25	73:11
7:15, 7:20, 8:3,	designed 61:6, 66:5	differential 71:5
8:9, 21:8, 22:20,	desperately 7:12	difficult 66:11
34:24, 39:8,	DESPINS 2:6, 20:16,	difficulties 79:14
39:13, 40:7,	20:17, 21:3,	direct 11:16, 39:15,
40:14, 40:16,	21:19, 21:22,	39:16, 40:7,
50:16, 51:2, 51:6,	22:12, 22:22,	40:14, 46:14
53:6, 53:13, 54:5,	23:1, 23:5, 23:11,	directed 41:4, 81:15
56:15, 56:21,	24:22, 25:5,	direction 22:3,
57:14, 59:9, 78:4,	26:13, 27:1,	64:16, 64:21
80:10, 80:14,	60:11, 73:17,	directly 16:22,
80:18, 81:11,	73:19, 74:7, 74:8,	36:10, 38:11,
81 : 15	74:13, 76:1, 76:14	39:3, 39:23, 46:2
December 13:13,	despite 9:17, 38:18	Director 7:5, 9:9,
17:4, 17:22, 18:5,	detail 17:6, 65:4,	27:8, 28:7
18:16, 42:22	78 : 20	directs 29:9
decide 25:12	detailed 7:17, 8:2,	disagree 37:21
decision 38:4,	68:10	disagreed 67:7
78:21, 80:3, 82:18	detailing 31:11	disallow 33:21,
decisions 73:3	determination 53:24,	41:23, 45:7, 48:4,
defer 16:21, 55:10,	66:22, 66:23,	49:2
63:17	67:3, 81:21	disallowance 34:16
deficient 13:5,	determinations 54:1,	disallowed 35:11,
13:16, 16:17	54:10	37:17, 37:22,
defined 50:12, 53:20	determine 10:2,	39:15, 43:15,
definitely 25:13	16:17, 24:8, 53:12	44:17, 46:16,
degree 60:10	determined 54:7,	47:16, 49:16
Dein 23:16	57:20	disallowing 49:23
delay 25:15	determines 75:20,	disaster 7:9, 7:12,
delineates 31:19	81:8	10:6, 10:8
deliver 16:10, 63:1,	determining 20:8,	disasters 10:16
81:11	57:17	disburse 10:12
demonstrates 40:6	Detroit 21:25	disbursed 10:18
denial 5:1	develop 7:21, 8:6,	disbursement 10:5
Department 10:8,	30:23	discharged 45:22,
30:3, 71:13	developing 27:23	47:13, 48:16,
Departments 10:1	Development 10:9,	49:13
depend 67:24	82:19	discharges 46:10
depending 67:22, 73:12	device 4:16, 4:17, 4:24, 5:1	disclosed 29:18 Disclosure 5:17,
deployment 20:8	devices 4:12, 4:15,	5:20, 27:21, 28:1,
derivative 37:5	5 : 2	31:7
described 53:10,	Diaz 27:10, 28:21	discuss 16:5
53:15, 56:22,	difference 35:18,	discussed 24:22
61:21, 80:22	37 : 3	discussing 60:1
description 56:16	differences 9:18,	discussion 22:3,

32 : 7	60:22	efficiently 63:3
discussions 15:12,	dormant 81:1	efforts 6:9, 10:13,
60:9	double 10:14	11:3, 11:8, 12:2
dismissed 13:16	down 10:21, 12:21,	eight 79:19
		=
dispute 43:6, 43:16,	25:22, 25:23,	Either 12:7, 17:14,
46:8, 46:12, 79:1	38:22, 59:19,	18:15, 24:14,
disputes 48:15	63:23, 75:11,	41:24, 42:2, 42:3,
distinct 57:24	81:13	45:9, 53:14,
distributed 36:1	down. 77:7, 82:16	53:21, 61:1,
	-	
distribution 6:22,	dozens 9:15	61:16, 64:6,
31:15, 31:17, 40:9	draft 7:24, 8:12,	71:16, 71:18,
Distributors 45:14,	11:25, 29:18,	74 : 25
46:19, 46:24,	29:25	Elections 42:16
47:3, 47:5, 47:7,	drawn 10:21	Electric 1:20
	due 51:12, 51:16,	electrical 26:17
47:11, 47:18		
District 1:1, 1:3,	54:19, 55:3, 67:3,	electronic 4:12,
1:28, 1:29, 59:24,	76:2, 80:24	4:15
80:3, 84:1, 84:2,	duplicate 21:3,	elsewhere 71:6
84:7	58:15	embrace 74:3
Docket 1:6, 13:12,	duplicating 57:9	Emergency 10:7
	= -	2 4
21:19, 35:14,	during 4:24, 64:6	emerging 5:23
53:4, 57:14,		EMMA 27:25
77:25, 79:21,		employed 12:3
80:15	< E >	Employee 6:10,
doctrine 79:3, 79:10	e-mailing 4:23	17:14, 17:25,
documentation 17:7,	earlier 24:22,	41:20, 50:13,
17:9, 17:13,	29:25, 39:4,	56:4, 57:7, 71:9,
31:11, 33:14,	45:25, 48:6, 67:5	76:25, 78:7, 78:16
33:17, 34:10,	early 22:24	Employees 5:19, 6:3,
39:25, 40:5,	earmarked 13:15	55:25, 56:4,
40:19, 40:21,	Earned 11:10	57:10, 78:10
77:21	ECF 35:8, 42:5,	employment 50:25,
documents 4:17,	42:8, 45:5, 45:15,	51:11
34:20, 34:23,	48:3, 48:12	
	·	enable 8:3
35:7, 35:12,	echo 26:15	enacted 29:5
35:14, 35:15,	economic 10:11,	enactment 29:12
37:10, 39:20,	11:3, 25:2, 26:18	encapsulates 72:24
39:21	economy 7:7, 25:16	encourage 22:23,
doing 14:24, 23:7,	Education 10:1,	64:13
25:19, 30:12,	30:4, 30:5	end 6:24, 9:4, 12:2,
58:15	•	
	effect 57:8, 79:11	12:8, 12:10,
dollar 51:3	effective 6:20,	15:21, 16:8, 23:6,
dollars 8:17, 8:18,	31:18, 53:8, 58:4,	63:24, 67:11,
10:19, 14:9, 67:6	65:25	75 : 13
done 19:24, 22:4,	effectively 30:1	energy 6:20, 24:25,
26:2, 31:19, 73:24	efficient 10:3,	25:4
Doral 59:6, 59:10,	24:25, 57:1,	engagement 31:6,
59:15, 59:18,	72:10, 75:6,	32:12
59:24, 60:2,	75:21, 79:12,	enhanced 26:18, 57:1
60:11, 60:19,	80:14, 81:9	enough 17:11, 18:2,

10.0 22.14	20.6	
18:8, 22:14,	estimates 29:6,	expectation 55:1,
34:13, 65:14,	29:11, 30:20	69:18
66:8, 66:10, 68:4	et 1:16, 1:35, 21:3,	expectations 76:13
ensue 22:8	70:17	expected 70:22
ensure 6:19, 56:14,	evaluate 53:12, 57:5	expecting 11:21,
66:14	evaluating 79:10	35:13
ensuring 10:3, 28:13	evaluator 15:15	expedite 50:9
enter 32:20, 44:18,	event 58:9, 75:19,	expediting 15:2
47:17, 49:22,	81:7	expeditiously 62:20
58:19	events 74:1	expended 24:23
entered 8:20, 20:20,	everybody 68:22,	expenditures 29:7
20:23, 21:14,	70:10, 72:10	expenses 25:19
32:12, 42:1,	everyone 5:3, 14:2,	expensive 25:3
50:21, 64:8	26:2	experience 74:19
entire 6:12	everything 44:10,	explained 76:22
entirely 67:1	63:9	explaining 5:20
entirety 41:5,	evidence 37:6, 38:1	explains 73:13
44:15, 45:7, 47:5,	ex 27:9	explanation 41:2
47:16, 48:4, 49:10	exact 67:23	explanations 17:24
entities 50:22	exactly 56:6	exploratory 12:2
entitled 31:20,	Examiner 32:6, 32:9,	expressed 11:5
35:18, 38:8	32:13	expressly 50:20,
entitlement 69:6,	example 18:9, 51:20,	50:22
69:7, 69:8, 69:11	67:4, 74:14, 81:20	expunged 21:10
entity 14:16, 47:9,	excellent 9:12,	expunging 19:24
69:19	11:17	extend 53:22, 66:7,
Entry 21:19, 77:22,	except 37:5	73:24
77:25	excess 40:3	extended 6:15, 30:20
enumerated 71:10	excited 64:15	extensively 27:16
equitable 11:9	exclusively 63:7	extent 9:18, 43:8,
ERS 41:25, 42:3,	excused 32:13	47:5, 47:11,
69:14, 69:15,	Executive 7:4, 9:8,	49:11, 49:17,
69:19, 78:3	27:8, 28:7, 28:16,	51:15, 51:16,
Esq 2:16, 2:22	28:17, 28:19,	52:8, 52:10,
essence 25:2	28:20, 29:1, 29:9,	52:14, 60:20,
essential 10:9	29:21	60:22, 65:8, 66:1,
essentially 17:8,	exempt 60:21	66:17, 67:2,
17:23	Exhibit 44:16,	68:13, 71:3, 79:12
established 28:14	47:15, 49:15,	externally 60:6
establishes 29:1	49:17, 49:21,	extraordinarily
Estate 2:20, 24:16,	49:23	26:19
29:20, 29:22,	EXHIBITS 3:9	extraordinary 26:16,
42:8, 42:12,	existence 79:23	59:4, 60:15, 60:19
42:17, 42:20,	existing 50:10,	extrapolating 14:9
42:25, 43:6, 43:8,	51:9, 51:18, 53:9,	eye 27:3, 81:11
43:11, 43:16,	53:15, 57:6, 58:5,	
44:8, 44:12,	69:22, 78:11	
44:19, 79:12,	expansion 11:10	< F >
80:14	expect 65:10, 65:23,	faces 65:15
estimate 30:23	73:23	facilitating 15:11

fact 13:15, 13:16,	figure 16:8, 75:25	79:19
14:3, 14:10,	figured 58:23	formal 29:10, 38:2
14:23, 38:18,	file 6:15, 18:22,	formally 8:22
39:15, 43:16,	20:12, 34:14,	format 81:5
48:17, 56:3,	35:1, 35:10,	formed 18:20
56:23, 57:4,	35:13, 35:14,	former 36:16
62:17, 64:5	37:10, 50:23,	forms 8:3, 17:11,
factors 26:21,	56:13, 58:7, 65:21	29:10
56:23 , 80:5	filing 8:16, 9:22,	forth 31:17, 43:2,
fall 51:10, 59:8	18:21, 18:25,	48:20
falling 45:8, 48:5	20:23	forum 79:23
- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
familiar 57:11	filings 39:19, 57:15	forward 6:14, 18:23,
families 11:11	final 32:8, 66:22,	19:24, 26:24,
far 27:19, 67:9	67:13, 69:25,	27:12, 30:9,
fashion 58:9, 62:15	73:22	30:15, 36:19,
faster 7:11	finances 28:10	38:4, 43:10,
favor 56:24, 80:7,	Financial 1:9, 2:10,	52:14, 55:6, 68:20
81:24	17:1, 59:6, 62:4	found 4:23, 14:7,
	·	32:6
favorable 82:1	financing 74:22	
feasibility 79:19	find 14:18, 73:25,	four 59:8, 79:15,
feasible 82:15	74:10, 75:16	80:9, 81:16
features 4:18,	finding 17:20, 19:3	fraction 10:21
11:24, 15:6, 80:11	findings 29:7	frame 53:23, 68:22
featuring 31:10	finds 80:12	frames 66:7, 66:14
February 42:19	fine 24:15, 72:11	free 14:17
Federal 7:11, 9:6,	First 5:13, 9:4,	frequently 9:8
10:4, 10:5, 10:7,	19:5, 28:17, 31:9,	FRIEDMAN 2:11,
10:24, 11:8,	37:2, 37:8, 37:22,	24:12, 24:13,
27:11, 28:18,	50:19, 59:4,	26:5, 26:10,
28:21, 28:24,	59:10, 59:20,	26:11, 26:12,
29:23, 30:4,	69:25, 71:12	32:1, 32:4
30:17, 31:1, 79:1,	Fiscal 2:9, 6:25,	front 12:2, 12:8,
79:5	7:2, 9:16, 28:11,	12:10, 15:21,
Federation 76:18	28:13, 29:8,	22:6, 22:16
Fee 14:18, 32:5,	29:11, 29:19	fronts 26:16
32:9, 32:13	five 79:16	frozen 61:21
feedback 7:22, 8:10,	fixed 30:20, 30:23	full 23:16, 24:3,
30:8	flow 31:20	54:13, 54:15,
feel 72:7	focus 12:15, 20:8	55:4, 55:18
feels 36:24	focused 17:5, 17:13,	fully 20:20, 41:24,
fees 24:23, 32:8,	28:12	42:5, 42:14, 67:9
32:11	focusing 27:24	function 15:14,
fell 13:24	folks 51:13, 74:20	15:15, 61:7
felt 14:12, 18:22	follow-up 77:20	fund 35:5, 35:19,
FEMA 10:7, 10:11,	following 5:16,	35:20, 35:23,
30:19, 30:22,	78:19	35:25, 36:5, 36:9,
30:25, 31:2	force 58:14	36:16, 36:17,
few 10:15, 69:3,	forced 57:5	37:5, 37:15,
82:6	form 14:4, 17:8,	37:18, 38:6,
fewer 13:22, 57:15	25:4, 27:4, 77:24,	38:10, 38:11,
10,01 10.22, 07.10	20.1, 21.1, 11.21,	30.10, 30.11,

39:23, 40:2, 40:9,	gotten 12:12, 75:5	60:25, 66:2, 75:25
40:11, 45:25, 46:1	governing 57:7	handled 50:16, 62:8,
fundamentally 26:22	Government 6:3, 7:3,	62:20, 63:21
fundamentals 31:11	7:11, 9:11, 10:4,	happen 24:5, 24:10,
funding 7:12, 10:6,	14:20, 22:12,	73 : 13
10:8, 10:9, 10:12,	23:21, 26:7, 27:7,	happening 24:2
10:18, 30:4,	27:23, 28:9,	happens 73:22
30:17, 31:1	28:18, 29:16,	happy 18:16, 21:20,
funds 10:2, 10:19,	29:23, 30:11,	55:20, 58:20,
31:17, 33:10,	41:21, 51:7,	64:9, 64:19, 70:6,
33:15, 34:11,	65:25, 66:5,	73:9, 73:12
34:22, 35:1, 35:5,	66:14, 74:21	harshly 30:11
39:2, 40:1, 45:12,	governmental 26:21,	Harvey 10:17
45:24, 46:3,	28:8	Hastings 20:18
46:13, 47:7,	Governments 9:7	head 23:19, 77:7,
47:10, 48:9	Governor 9:8, 9:10,	77:16, 82:16
future 5:1, 25:14,	9:15, 23:23, 24:1,	hear 12:25, 19:10,
55 : 4	25:5, 25:10,	23:9, 38:15,
	25:22, 27:8, 27:9,	38:17, 68:14,
	27:17, 28:7,	73:17, 77:15
< G >	28:11, 28:15,	heard 5:7, 19:13,
gather 11:15, 40:20	28:22, 28:23,	44:7, 46:18, 49:4,
gave 14:1, 29:25,	29:4, 30:3, 30:12,	77:13, 82:21,
30:7	30:15	82 : 24
GDB 45:11, 48:8	Gracia-gracia 83:4	HEARING 1:27, 4:20,
general 5:14, 9:5	granted 13:19,	5:15, 7:20, 8:1,
generally 21:12	78:21, 78:24	8:20, 13:13, 17:4,
generate 76:12	granting 77:25	17:23, 18:5, 19:8,
generating 10:11	Great 9:17, 15:21,	24:3, 24:5, 25:17,
generation 6:21	33:3, 68:25, 69:3,	32:14, 33:11,
getting 25:16,	69:12, 72:20,	37:9, 38:4, 40:13,
74:14, 76:8	73:15, 74:5	41:2, 73:19, 79:7,
give 12:20, 16:16,	greatly 57:1	83:3, 83:6, 83:10
18:24, 26:13,	grievance 50:14,	hearings 57:15
42:9, 62:16,	55:15, 55:17,	heartened 14:14
75:16, 82:1	55:23, 56:3,	held 9:15, 28:11,
given 32:16, 41:2,	56:11, 76:23,	36:8, 36:9, 37:16,
57:19	76:25, 78:17	38:6, 38:12, 40:8,
gives 18:4, 22:18	grievances 56:5,	40:20, 57:15
giving 67:23, 73:21	56:8, 78:10	help 8:6, 18:24,
glitches 13:24	ground 73:21	22:24, 68:21,
goal 58:3, 60:25,	grounds 42:14	72:16
61:14, 62:9, 68:18	Group 6:3	helpful 12:23, 15:2,
goals 29:14, 74:2	groups 6:2, 6:7	15:22, 16:7,
God 24:9	guidance 7:19, 8:10	18:17, 20:7, 68:7, 68:11, 72:15,
Gold 41:14, 45:14,		73:16
46:2, 46:4, 46:13,	< H >	
46:19, 46:24,		high 8:5, 24:3,
47:3, 47:5, 47:7,	hair 76:6	53:10, 73:18
47:11, 47:18	handle 52:12, 58:12,	high-level 73:1

highly 31:21	28:16, 71:20,	82:2, 82:8
Hill 7:5, 7:10	72:4, 83:12	informative 34:12,
hit 65:22	Importantly 50:18,	35:14, 75:8
hold 39:23, 62:5	58:3	informed 15:20, 64:4
holder 36:17	improve 80:13	infrastructures
holding 35:20	improve 30:13	10:10
holdings 40:12	in. 15:25	initial 53:24, 54:9,
Honorable 1:28, 84:6	inasmuch 14:12	74:4, 81:17, 81:20
hoped 8:5	inclination 73:18	initially 13:14
hopeful 8:5, 60:3,	inclined 58:19,	initiated 81:19
60:9	73:19	initiated 81.19
hopefully 13:12,	include 22:3, 29:10,	insight 12:20
13:21, 20:11, 64:7	32:8, 60:5, 64:9,	Instance 9:24,
hopes 6:8, 27:19	64:20, 73:9,	59:21, 69:23,
Housing 10:9	81:18, 82:5, 82:10	71:12, 75:7
HTA 78:3	included 5:16,	instances 57:21
	19:18, 21:23,	Instead 33:17,
HUD 10:11, 10:22, 10:23		•
	50:23, 51:23, 58:18, 64:25,	51:12, 56:21, 73:21, 77:1
hundred 14:9, 18:6, 19:4	70:13	instructions 77:20
hundreds 55:25	includes 77:20	instrumental 6:12
Hurricane 10:17,	includes 77.20	instruments 38:7
30:21, 30:24	4:21, 4:25, 11:9,	intend 8:13, 51:2,
hurricanes 10:14,	33:24, 48:23,	53:13, 59:9,
19:15	54:9, 68:11, 68:23	59:11, 63:19
hyphen 80:2	Income 11:10	intending 56:3
11/1211 001	inconsistent 29:8	intends 32:20
	increased 21:6	intent 11:4
< I >	increases 23:25	interactions 11:23
ideal 72:12	indicate 42:4, 64:12	interest 4:6, 8:18,
ideas 14:2	indicated 21:15	24:22, 36:17,
identified 17:14	indicates 70:12,	39:6, 39:12, 40:8,
identify 53:13,	71:11	45:9, 45:10, 48:7,
64:24	indicating 34:13,	48:8, 75:21, 79:5,
identifying 17:5,	35:15 , 65:9	79:6, 81:9
17:11	indication 17:19	interested 76:5
III 1:8, 5:24, 9:20,	individual 5:6, 6:7,	intermediary 36:5
11:2, 26:19, 28:2,	37:14, 45:25,	interrogate 23:4
39:24, 49:20,	48:11, 60:7	invested 12:1,
50:15, 51:8,	influx 18:20, 51:19	33:16, 45:12, 48:9
57:24, 58:8,	information 4:14,	investigated 14:6
61:22, 63:20,	8:3, 17:7, 17:12,	investigations 32:10
71:6, 80:16, 81:2	17:16, 18:2, 18:8,	investment 36:8,
impact 29:6, 29:10	18:12, 19:18,	36:9, 38:9, 39:9
implement 30:23	21:9, 27:21,	investments 33:9,
implementation 7:1,	31:22, 51:22,	45:11, 45:23,
9:16, 78:6, 80:13	52:16, 65:9,	46:3, 47:6, 47:9,
implemented 78:23	65:15, 68:5, 68:8,	48:8
importance 26:16	76:12, 81:18,	investor 31:6,
important 26:19,	81:20, 81:23,	31:10, 46:1, 46:13

investors 31:8,	26:23, 29:12, 35:4	language 21:7, 75:1,
31:21	Jointly 1:11	75:13, 76:3, 76:24
invoice 42:1	Jose 2:16, 76:17	large 17:14, 53:3
invoked 67:12	JRF 41:14, 45:14,	largely 57:20
involve 64:16	46:2, 46:4, 46:13,	last 13:11, 28:6,
involved 15:25	46:19, 46:24,	28:15, 31:4,
involved 13.23	47:3, 47:5, 47:7,	33:11, 37:9, 50:21
Irma 10:14	47:11, 47:17	lasts 6:16
irrevocable 81:3	Juan 4:1, 4:7, 83:6,	later 20:11
issue 9:1, 68:16,	83:7	latest 8:11
74:23	Judge 1:28, 1:29,	latter 71:24
issued 4:11, 28:16,	5:9, 15:14, 23:16,	Laura 1:28, 1:36,
39:24, 42:2,	84:7	33:3, 63:17, 84:7
42:24, 45:10,	judicial 4:10, 12:6,	Law 17:25, 18:1,
45:11, 45:12,	12:8, 69:24,	18:3, 53:23, 57:6,
48:7, 48:8, 48:9,	69:25, 80:22, 82:9	57:18, 57:20,
48:25, 49:18	July 7:19, 8:1,	66:18, 70:24,
issuer 38:11	9:19, 14:2, 22:1,	79:7, 79:13,
issues 9:24, 12:14,	23:4	79:15, 79:20,
20:19, 25:23,	jump 62:9, 83:2	80:17
30:14, 30:25,	juncture 80:7	Lawful 6:5
57:18, 57:19,	June 22:1, 27:24	laws 29:5, 29:6,
57:24, 57:25,	jurisdiction 71:14,	29:8, 71:1
60:1, 60:22,	74:9, 74:24	LCDC 6:5
79:13, 79:20,	jurisdictional 79:16	lead 15:10, 28:4
80:8, 80:17, 80:18	jury 79:24	leaders 28:8
Item 5:5, 32:5,	justice 75:21, 79:5,	leadership 22:19
44:25, 47:23,	81:9	learned 25:7
50:3, 82:22	justification 27:3	least 59:15, 61:24,
Items 32:24, 50:3	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	72:8
itself 14:20, 18:20,		leave 70:13
21:15, 40:11,	< K >	leaves 50:3
42:10, 52:13,	Katrina 10:17	Lecaroz 1:41
56:21, 57:5,	Keep 12:12, 19:19,	legal 40:6, 70:15
64:14, 68:21	68:19, 74:9, 83:13	legislative 11:7
IV.1 50:3	keeping 81:11	legislature 25:6,
IV.2 32:24, 50:3	keeps 74:24	25:10, 25:22
IV.4 5:5, 44:25	key 6:22, 58:10	less 25:3, 38:7,
IV.5 47:23	kind 73:17, 75:15	52:24
	knowledgeable 72:10	letter 16:18, 18:6,
	knows 23:16, 29:4,	51:14
< J >	60:11	letters 8:2, 8:4,
J. 1:35		13:3, 16:15, 18:7,
JAMS 12:24		18:16, 19:3, 19:4,
January 24:4, 25:17	< L >	19:20, 20:21
Jaresko 7:5, 9:14,	L. 2:16	letting 62:21
29:25	Labor 71:13	level 36:21, 53:9,
job 30:13	lacks 40:14, 46:2,	53:10, 69:25,
Joint 5:16, 5:21,	46:13, 47:7	73:18
9:24, 24:22,	laments 10:5	levels 73:2

liabilities 5:23,	litigations 59:5,	map 64:14
18:3, 42:4, 42:15,	60:24	march 27:4
42:18, 43:3,	little 13:8, 15:10,	Maria 10:14, 30:24
43:10, 43:17,	15:18, 18:4,	marked 63:19
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
45:8, 47:6, 48:5,	32:16, 37:8,	marking 56:17
48:14, 51:2, 52:9	38:22, 38:23,	Marrero 27:9, 28:8,
liability 41:25,	76:12	30:2, 30:6
42:11, 47:11,	live 25:21, 25:24	Marsal 16:23
49:11, 49:18	loaded 4:17	Martin 1:35, 5:11
liable 45:5, 48:2,	local 53:22, 66:18	massive 81:2
48:24	long 20:19, 62:13,	Master 40:23
Librada 40:20	67:19	match 10:16, 72:8
life 25:7	long-term 10:11	matches 40:22
Lift 63:6, 83:4	longer 36:5, 37:17,	material 22:14
light 39:15, 42:24,	53:23, 66:16, 82:2	materials 82:13
43:15, 48:17,	look 75:11	matter 5:7, 34:8,
55:8, 80:22	looking 12:23, 16:9,	37:11, 40:6,
likelihood 79:22	60:5, 76:6	61:12, 82:18
likely 15:19, 80:13	looks 6:13	matters 12:4, 28:21,
Likewise 13:18,	loss 35:6, 37:18,	32:7, 32:18, 59:7,
13:20, 14:12	38:9, 40:3, 40:4	60:17, 79:20,
limbo 62:10, 62:19	losses 36:17, 37:4,	82 : 22
limited 4:21, 5:1,	37:6, 39:10	Mckinsey 32:10,
13:6, 15:6	lot 20:22, 26:1,	32:11
limits 82:11	63 : 25	mean 24:1, 50:15,
line 10:16, 24:24	lots 55:7	66 : 20
lines 17:19, 18:1,	Luc 2:6, 20:17	meaning 74:10
18:20, 60:19,	Luis 76:17	means 53:8, 64:9
64:20		meant 69:7
liquidate 57:6		measures 7:2, 7:4
liquidated 34:21,	< M >	mechanics 8:24,
38:7, 54:5, 54:12,	machine 23:15	65 : 25
57:17, 67:9, 67:19	Maestros 2:15, 76:18	mechanism 62:14,
liquidating 53:8	magistrate 22:7	74 : 25
liquidation 33:14,	magnitude 65:22,	mechanisms 22:19,
35:19, 38:8, 39:1,	67 : 25	62:25, 80:11,
56:24, 57:19,	mail 65:7	80 : 25
66:23, 80:9	mailed 8:1	Mediation 6:8, 6:12,
list 69:23, 72:21	mailing 7:25, 21:15	6:13, 6:15, 12:3,
listed 44:16, 47:15,	mailings 8:13,	15:6, 15:9, 15:13,
49:15, 49:17,	21:14, 65:7	71:12
49:20, 49:23,	main 21:22, 21:23,	mediators 12:16,
82:22	34:24, 37:2,	15 : 24
listened 44:11,	37:13 , 79:18	Medicaid 11:10
46:22, 49:8	maintains 64:16	meet 6:6, 7:2, 80:24
litigation 18:11,	manage 76:13	meeting 27:12, 30:3
23:15, 24:10,	Management 1:10,	meetings 9:16
24:17, 25:17,	6:21, 10:7, 17:1	meets 27:3
59:19, 60:4,	mandatory 21:25	member 30:10
60:16, 61:16	manner 31:16	members 4:6, 60:11

mention 31:4	39:2, 39:23, 40:8,	nice 73:13
mentioned 27:15,	40:9, 40:11,	nine 41:23, 79:20
28:2, 28:22, 29:24	45:11, 45:24,	No. 1:6
merely 15:11	45:25, 46:1, 46:3,	nod 77:9, 77:18
middle 37:18	46:13, 47:7,	Nodding 77:5, 77:7,
million 8:17, 14:9	47:10, 48:9	82:16
mind 75:15	Myers 26:12	nomenclature 15:5,
minimis 14:20	1	78 : 15
minimize 25:20		nondebtor 79:25
minimum 14:7	< N >	None 3:5, 3:11
minute 16:14	namely 78:7	nonjudicial 12:7,
minutes 82:7	Natalie 7:5, 9:14	15:24
misstating 55:10	Natural 30:10	nonspecific 17:24
models 15:9	nature 13:6, 50:14,	nonsubstantive 21:7,
modification 8:23,	61:15, 79:14	21:11
9:3, 58:6	neared 18:19	nontitle 28:2
modifications 78:20	necessarily 52:3,	nor 4:14
modify 73:24, 74:10,	52:12, 61:4,	Noreen 2:22, 33:15,
75:18, 81:6	65:14 , 67:23	34 : 6
moment 70:11, 75:17	necessary 5:5, 7:7,	normal 51:25
money 18:24, 22:6,	12:6, 28:4, 31:22,	note 30:9, 64:2
24:17, 43:9, 70:21	52:11, 60:6,	noted 26:20
monitor 7:1, 56:15	64:18, 66:17,	notes 4:16, 4:17,
Monsita 1:41	73:25, 75:20, 81:8	75 : 16
month 52:23	need 8:8, 15:16,	nothing 19:6, 40:5
monthly 31:15	20:22, 50:19,	notice 10:23, 33:25,
months 42:17, 68:2	57:3, 68:13, 72:5	56:12, 64:11,
morning 4:5, 5:3,	needlessly 24:23	64:20, 70:8,
5:6, 5:9, 5:10,	needs 7:13, 9:25,	71:21, 72:8,
11:20, 16:24,	52:7, 52:17,	72:24, 73:10,
16:25, 20:17,	52:18, 72:17,	73:13, 74:4, 75:8,
26:10, 26:11,	73:24	76:3, 77:24,
34:5, 76:17,	negative 77:18	81:19, 82:9
76:20, 76:21	negotiated 6:1	notices 64:3
Moscoso 48:12,	negotiations 5:25,	notification 19:18
48:13, 48:15,	11:2, 27:20, 28:3	notified 8:19
48:22, 49:5, 49:9,	Nevertheless 51:5,	noting 64:9
49:11, 49:23	80:25	November 82:14
moved 72:18	New 1:38, 2:12, 4:7,	Number 8:7, 13:18,
Moving 23:11, 26:24,	7:17, 11:18, 24:1,	15:6, 18:10,
27:12, 47:21,	24:12, 26:6, 27:8,	18:13, 21:6, 33:1,
68:20	31:6, 31:8, 31:13,	33:19, 35:9,
Mudd 12:23, 14:14	32:11, 34:15,	35:11, 40:22,
municipal 28:1	35:10, 36:15,	41:18, 42:5, 42:8,
mutual 33:10, 33:14,	59:24, 76:23,	42:9, 43:4, 43:21,
35:19, 35:20,	83:5, 83:7, 83:9	45:6, 45:15,
35:22, 35:25, 36:5, 36:0, 36:16	newspapers 23:20	45:16, 48:3,
36:5, 36:9, 36:16,	Next 13:12, 19:8, 32:5, 61:18,	48:12, 48:13,
36:17, 38:6, 38:10, 38:11,	73:14, 83:2, 83:6	53:3, 57:2, 58:25, 67:24, 73:11,
30:10, 30:11,	13:14, 03:4, 03:0	0/:24, /3:11,

77 : 25	69:21, 72:20,	71:4, 72:8
numbers 8:25, 21:19,	74:13, 75:3, 82:4	ought 75:11
65:13	Omar 27:8, 30:2	outcomes 51:4
numerous 19:3	OMB 9:23, 29:9	outside 4:13, 9:24,
	Omni 72:2, 72:4,	12:10, 51:8
	72:6, 72:18	outstanding 8:16,
< 0 >	Once 23:2, 46:18,	38:20, 40:18
O'melveny 26:12	54:11, 67:18	overall 58:3
object 34:16, 37:23,	one. 77:19	overruled 44:13,
52 : 6	ones 17:22, 17:23,	47:4, 49:9
objected 58:2	35:1, 65:1, 65:16	overruling 44:18,
objecting 52:3, 52:5	ongoing 8:25, 9:17,	47:17, 49:22
Objections 13:11,	65:10, 80:19,	overview 7:16
14:25, 16:15,	83:11	owed 18:3, 42:12,
16:19, 17:3, 17:4,	open-ended 81:4	42:18, 43:1, 43:4,
18:16, 19:20,	_	43:8, 43:9, 53:12,
	operating 62:25	
20:24, 21:1,	operative 73:21	78:9
21:16, 32:21,	opportunity 12:15,	owes 42:14
32:24, 33:24,	15:21, 19:12,	owing 51:12, 51:16,
40:16, 61:16	19:23, 23:3, 37:23	67:3
·		
obligate 10:12	opposed 15:11, 56:8,	own 75:7
obligation 19:19,	65:17	owned 29:20, 39:5,
67 : 5	opposition 78:5	39:23
observed 4:22	option 27:18, 71:22	owners 35:2
observing 4:7	_	ownership 39:6,
=	oral 30:8, 78:20	
obvious 29:14, 76:7	Orders 4:11, 6:17,	39:16, 45:9,
obviously 26:25,	21:1, 21:19,	45:10, 47:12,
30:25, 35:25,	28:16, 32:12,	48:7, 48:14,
36:24	32:19, 32:21,	49:12, 49:18
		owns 31:19
occupy 42:16	45:18, 47:13,	OWIIS 31:19
occur 24:17	55:20, 67:25	
October 28:10,	ordinarily 50:16,	
29:18, 29:25	61:8, 70:24	< P >
odd 55:23	ordinary 53:6, 54:4,	pace 20:8, 66:3
offer 22:25		
	60:25, 61:1, 61:9,	PAGE 3:3, 69:1
offered 3:5, 3:11	61:12, 62:1,	pages 84:4
Office 7:21, 7:23,	67:19, 67:20,	paid 42:5, 43:1,
8:11, 11:24,	68:1, 72:1, 77:1	43:5, 43:7, 43:17,
11:25, 12:1,	organization 12:24	54:13, 54:15,
	_	
28:23, 30:13,	organized 75:9	55:18, 58:9,
30:18, 71:12	original 33:20,	61:24, 62:8,
Official 2:4, 6:2,	33:21, 36:20,	67:18, 68:12,
20:18, 84:14	36:22, 39:14,	74:15, 76:8, 77:1
officio 27:9	40:15, 43:7,	paper 19:16, 21:9
offline 21:18	43:17, 44:13,	papers 5:6, 78:5
often 22:24, 23:14,	53:17, 54:14,	paperwork 64:14
61 : 15	55:14, 66:8	Paragraph 61:18,
Okay 41:17, 53:2,	originally 76:24	63:14, 64:23,
66:25, 67:17,	otherwise 4:22,	67:17, 69:5,
68:24, 69:12,	4:23, 6:17, 59:8,	70:12, 71:11,

81:16	54:18, 54:24,	52:18, 52:19
part 4:14, 15:23,	55:1, 55:3, 67:5,	placed 62:5
49:16, 49:24,	69:14, 69:15,	planning 63:15,
,		
65:5, 73:25,	69:23, 78:8	64:1, 75:12
75:19, 75:24, 81:7	pension/retiree	plans 6:25, 7:2,
participants 4:8	78 : 15	28:14, 29:8
particular 4:16,	pensions 52:9	platform 31:8
-	=	_
17:4, 28:13, 35:6,	people 6:20, 15:11,	pleading 14:14
59:5 , 79:7	15:13, 18:21,	plenty 23:3
particularized 81:5	19:12, 19:15,	podium 11:18
particularly 7:11,	23:24, 25:19,	point 12:9, 21:18,
		_ ·
10:6, 35:3, 73:4,	51:21, 52:22,	21:23, 22:5,
80:21	56:12, 65:20,	22:15, 22:16,
parties 4:6, 4:22,	73:6, 76:7	25:25, 37:19,
8:11, 9:2, 33:23,	per 14:8, 21:6,	37:21, 39:4,
42:22, 53:22,	34:16, 35:2, 52:23	54:14, 55:13,
66:17, 67:7,	perfectly 72:11	62:7, 63:15,
79:25 , 80:4	perform 15:13	71:19, 73:18,
partner 7:16	performance 26:18	81:25
party 31:19	performed 57:9	point. 21:22
pass 35:21	perhaps 21:18, 35:4,	policies 4:11
=	<u> </u>	-
past 63:4	35:13, 62:8, 64:10	policy 28:11
path 73:22	period 62:11, 82:2,	political 25:7,
pathway 70:19	82 : 3	25:20, 26:21
Patricia 48:12	periodic 81:17	Ponce 42:7, 42:12,
Paul 20:18	periods 66:16	42:17, 42:20,
	_	
pausing 27:4	permanent 10:15	42:25, 43:6, 43:8,
pay 51:2, 53:6,	permission 47:22	43:11, 43:16,
55:3, 70:17, 74:22	permissive 79:3,	44:8, 44:12, 44:18
payment 48:25, 58:9,	79:11, 80:6	popping 75:4
58:13, 68:23,	permit 56:21, 64:4,	position 21:8,
70:16, 81:25	64:11, 64:21	27:24, 35:17,
payments 42:21,	permits 58:7	39:25
42:23, 42:25,	permitted 4:21	positioned 58:12
54:5, 54:18, 55:3,	permitting 58:13,	positive 30:16, 31:3
55:4, 55:6	80:7	possible 27:20,
		28:25, 29:15
pays 22:12	persistent 22:24	•
PBA 9:20, 78:3	PERSON 4:13, 4:21,	possibly 12:4
pending 11:2, 28:21,	25:23, 47:1, 72:25	post 30:20, 50:24
33:13, 38:19,	persons 50:22	post-hurricane 19:17
43:12, 57:22,	perspective 26:7,	postdated 19:15
		_
61:19, 65:6,	75:6	posted 27:25
81:20, 81:21,	Peter 2:11, 26:11	postponed 24:4
81:22	petitions 61:22	potential 31:8, 73:3
pension 5:23, 50:13,	phase 21:5, 81:20	potentially 53:5,
50:24, 51:11,	PHV 1:35, 1:36,	60:21, 66:16
		*
51:13, 51:21,	1:37, 2:6, 2:11	Power 1:21
51:25, 52:7, 52:9,	picture 8:7, 59:1	practicable 8:14
52:11, 52:15,	piece 21:9	practice 19:22,
52:23, 52:24,	place 19:5, 50:19,	63:16, 68:10,
	1 222 =212, 00,20,	

81:13	78:23, 79:2, 82:19	41:23, 42:4,
precise 81:14	proceed 21:16,	44:16, 45:8,
precisely 58:16	38:17, 54:8, 56:21	47:15, 48:5,
predominate 57:18,	proceeding 4:25,	49:15, 56:7, 66:12
79:13, 80:17	61:25, 79:7,	proper 33:25, 34:1
prefer 51:17, 68:6	79:15, 79:17,	properly 15:24,
premature 23:23	79:19, 79:24	16:18, 33:23,
PREPA 6:18, 6:19,	Proceedings 2:48,	36:13
6:21, 23:13,	4:15, 57:22,	property 42:16
23:16, 23:21,	57:23, 79:22,	proposal 7:15,
26:13, 26:23, 78:3	80:20, 81:2,	11:15, 11:22,
prepare 29:10, 72:5	83:15, 84:6	12:9, 12:16,
preparing 83:10	processing 63:2,	12:23, 15:12,
presence 79:15,	69:19, 70:15,	58:17, 63:1,
79:24	73:2, 81:14	75:22, 78:13,
present 33:24, 54:3,	produced 2:48	80:4, 81:10
60:22	production 24:25	proposals 15:5
presentation 23:12,	productive 23:6,	propose 8:13, 12:25,
58:24	27:20	76:23, 82:2
presented 37:9,	professionals 8:23,	Proposed 5:18, 5:20,
38:1, 66:6	8:24, 9:11	6:10, 7:21, 7:25,
presentment 32:20,	profile 31:12	8:13, 11:1, 11:22,
82:14	program 11:10	21:14, 21:15,
presents 60:23	progress 7:6, 9:17,	23:3, 32:12,
preserves 53:25	26:19, 27:19,	32:19, 32:21,
preserving 51:13	33:2, 56:16	41:4, 55:20,
press 4:7, 4:22	project 31:6	61:21, 65:7,
pressure 26:1	projects 10:15,	71:24, 78:13,
pretend 24:10	30:21	78:23, 80:13,
preview 68:8	PROMESA 11:1, 22:18,	80:23, 82:13
PRIDCO 8:15, 8:16,	28:17, 29:2, 29:4,	proposing 22:19
9:2, 9:3, 9:22	30:1, 30:2, 30:7,	Proskauer 5:11,
primary 5:15	51:1	17:1, 33:4
Prime 64:16, 64:21	promised 30:13	proud 30:14
principal 8:17,	promote 28:9, 29:15,	prove 34:10
39:11	73:6	provide 7:16, 8:2,
principles 78:25	Proof 18:25, 33:18,	11:8, 14:16, 17:6,
prior 13:3, 54:19,	33:20, 35:1,	17:11, 17:15,
59:5, 60:15,	40:15, 40:16,	17:19, 17:23,
60:24, 64:6	40:23, 42:9,	18:1, 18:2, 18:8,
priority 10:3	42:10, 42:13,	25:3, 31:21, 34:9,
private 6:21	43:3, 43:14,	39:2, 51:22, 53:7,
probably 13:16,	43:18, 43:22,	53:16, 53:20,
20:11	44:1, 44:6, 44:13,	65:4, 68:5, 81:14,
problem 12:11,	44:14, 44:21,	81:17, 82:7
72:23, 75:10	45:15, 45:16,	provided 7:19, 35:7,
problems 24:1, 75:23	45:23, 47:5,	58:17, 65:13,
procedural 80:24	48:13, 51:24,	82:20
Procedure 8:14,	52:15, 65:21	provides 53:23, 79:4
13:19, 22:7, 50:9,	Proofs 13:4, 40:17,	providing 7:6, 58:4,
13.13, 22.1, 30.3,	110013 13.4, 40.1/,	providing 7.0, 30.4,

72:24 provision 58:6, 63:6	races 12:17 raise 76:4	recognizes 27:19 recommendations
provisions 70:16,	raised 10:25, 24:11	32:10
79:1	raising 23:18,	reconcile 8:9
Public 4:6, 5:19,	23:19, 74:23	reconciled 50:10
6:4, 6:10, 8:16, 10:6, 28:10,	RAMOS 2:16, 76:16, 76:21, 77:11	reconciliation 13:9, 13:19, 56:18,
28:20, 30:5,	ran 74:22	56:19, 57:2,
31:16, 50:13,	ranking 30:10	57:13, 57:14,
71:9, 78:7, 78:9,	Rapisardi 26:6	63:20, 63:22,
78:16	rate 8:4, 23:24	64:7, 65:11, 67:6,
publication 10:23,	Re 1:6, 80:1	73:1, 77:23
31:14	reached 42:23, 81:23	Reconstruction
publicly 11:22,	reaching 60:10	10:13, 30:19
23:3, 27:17, 31:5	read 46:21, 49:7,	record 4:14, 30:12,
punctually 29:13	56:12	39:22, 41:1, 42:6,
purchase 42:1	ready 12:5 reaffirm 77:2	45:6, 48:3, 55:16, 80:23
purports 41:25 Pursuant 13:2,	Real 12:13, 20:12,	recorded 2:48
30:21, 37:4,	29:20, 29:22,	recording 4:20
45:18, 47:13,	42:8, 42:12,	records 42:3
49:13, 51:1,	42:17, 42:20,	recover 35:18, 35:21
51:25, 60:6, 79:3	42:25, 43:6, 43:8,	recoveries 10:8
put 13:21, 23:22,	43:11, 43:16,	Recovery 7:13,
56:10, 59:9, 64:1,	44:8, 44:12, 44:18	10:11, 30:18,
72:20	realistic 82:3	30:21 redeemed 35:6, 40:1
putting 16:23	really 14:22, 15:3, 17:5, 17:6, 19:1,	redemption 34:10,
	19:4, 19:5, 21:22,	34:21, 35:24,
< Q >	35:8, 35:9, 51:24,	40:2, 40:4
qualification 69:11	56:10, 58:10,	reduce 57:2
qualifying 8:23, 9:3	61:6, 64:15,	reduced 34:20
quantification 69:6,	65:16, 65:24	reduces 57:13
69:7, 69:9	reason 40:25, 50:19,	reduction 54:13,
quarter 9:4 question 40:20,	62:13 reasonable 15:20	54:16, 54:25 refer 4:17, 43:25,
50:12, 54:22,	reasons 11:6, 41:1,	65:3, 66:19, 78:1,
61:18, 80:6	78:19	78:3, 78:13, 78:17
questions 7:18,	recall 14:1, 18:19,	referred 23:14,
11:12, 11:14,	20:23	59:22
18:15, 31:25,	receive 31:20, 37:4,	referring 63:14,
32:2, 55:7, 58:20,	38:8, 65:8, 72:14	67:22
58:25, 63:23, 69:4	received 7:22, 8:12,	refers 59:4, 63:7,
quite 31:2	13:6, 21:16,	64:23, 69:5 refined 38:5
quote 50:24, 63:7, 69:14	35:19, 38:7, 40:9, 56:2	reflect 34:11
quoting 80:1	receiving 8:6, 8:10	reflected 23:25
1	recent 7:24, 27:7	reflecting 42:11,
	recently 7:5, 23:19	43:9
< R >	recited 82:6	reflects 6:1

reformulated 11:22	remaining 33:10,	34:20 , 35:12
reformulation 7:15	49:19	requesting 42:21,
refund 50:12, 59:25,	remains 8:5	58:7
61:24, 62:7,	remarkable 30:12	requests 5:2
74:20, 78:16	remarks 26:13,	require 55:21
refunds 57:7, 74:23,	26:15, 77:14	required 16:18,
78:9	*	<u>-</u>
	remind 4:10	50:23, 66:17, 81:6
refused 22:2	remotely 10:16	requirement 80:24
regard 76:22	remove 62:18	requires 10:22,
regarding 7:12,	removed 13:17, 13:20	10:23, 29:4
29:6, 32:10,	removing 13:12	rescind 73:24,
33:14, 33:25,	rent 42:11, 42:21,	75:19, 81:7
37:14, 52:8,	42:23, 42:25, 43:4	reservation 82:6
76:25, 80:10, 82:8	RENTAS 2:22, 34:5,	reserve 73:20,
Region 1:41	34:19, 35:24,	73:23, 75:18, 81:6
Register 10:24,	36:4, 36:11,	reserves 75:14
=		
63:16, 63:22,	36:14, 36:18,	Resiliency 26:18,
64:2, 64:9	36:23, 38:13,	30:19
registry 13:21,	39:21, 41:12	resolution 58:4,
56:19, 62:18,	rents 43:1, 43:9	66:19, 67:13,
63:20, 64:12,	Reply 34:14, 43:3,	75:21, 78:7, 79:1,
64:17, 64:18	48:20, 53:19,	80:12, 81:9
regular 68:10	72:1, 72:9, 72:13,	resolutions 29:12
regulations 29:19	72:16, 77:14, 78:5	resolve 48:22,
rejection 66:25	Report 5:8, 6:16,	51:17, 57:4, 61:8
relate 59:2	7:15, 11:13,	resolved 8:8, 12:7,
related 11:15,	12:16, 27:25,	51:8, 52:7, 52:20,
23:12, 29:13,	28:7, 32:3, 32:6,	53:14, 57:3,
57:22, 59:5, 69:5,	32:9	61:16, 63:25,
77:25, 79:8, 79:15	Reporter 84:14	64:2, 64:5, 64:10,
relatedness 79:17	reporting 31:14,	64:12, 65:17,
relates 42:9, 45:15,	68:11, 73:23,	66:20, 66:21,
70:15	74:3, 81:5, 81:15	68:12, 81:24
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
relating 21:14	reports 31:15, 81:17	resolving 56:20,
relations 9:5, 9:10,	repository 4:14	60 : 3
10:4, 31:10	representation	resource 12:13
relationship 36:16,	65:24 , 76:17	Resources 12:6,
45:21, 46:11,	representations	12:10, 20:9, 30:10
	=	
48:23	80:10, 80:18,	respectfully 39:13,
release 10:22, 31:1	81:12	43:10, 46:14, 49:1
released 45:22,	Representative 1:13,	respective 49:20
48:16	22:20, 27:9,	respectively 78:17
releases 46:10	28:22, 30:9, 75:10	respects 49:25
relevant 56:23,		respond 16:10, 24:20
•	representatives 7:3	<u> </u>
80:6, 80:7, 82:8	represented 6:3	responded 19:21
reliable 6:20	request 16:14,	responding 19:20,
Relief 7:9, 7:12,	33:11, 39:13,	62 : 21
10:18, 58:2,	43:14, 46:15,	response 8:4, 8:6,
71:16, 77:25	49:1, 75:8	21:15, 34:14,
relieve 80:15	requested 26:14,	38:15, 42:7,

40.10 40.6		1 4 . 0
42:13, 43:6,	ripe 34:8, 37:11	saw 14:9
44:11, 44:18,	Rivera 2:21	saying 37:3, 52:24,
45:14, 46:4, 46:8,	road 63:23	75:4
46:16, 47:3,	robust 22:24, 73:23	says 21:9, 75:2
47:17, 48:11,	rolled 31:5, 31:8	scheduled 83:2,
49:3, 49:9, 49:22,	Romualdo 2:20	83:4, 83:6
71:23, 71:25, 75:8	Rose 5:12, 17:1,	scheduling 12:16
response. 41:16,	33 : 4	scope 52:8
44:9, 46:20, 49:6,	ROSEN 1:37, 7:17,	se 34:16
83:1	11:16, 11:20,	se. 35:2
responses 8:12,	11:21, 13:2, 15:8,	second 7:14, 21:5,
13:6, 13:10,	16:1, 16:11,	23:22
32:22, 72:14	16:20, 18:18,	Section 29:2, 29:4,
responsibility 14:13	20:2, 20:10,	51:1, 78:25, 79:4,
responsive 62:15	55:10, 59:14,	79:17
restarted 81:19	59:17, 62:1, 62:3,	securities 28:1
restoring 10:10	62:4, 63:5, 63:12,	Seeing 41:17, 46:21,
Restructuring 7:8,	63:17, 67:4,	49:7, 83:2
8:20, 11:2, 25:1,	67:16, 68:18, 69:2	seek 58:13
27:13, 31:21	route 71:16, 71:17,	seeking 12:5, 15:10,
restructurings 28:3	71:18	28:4, 56:5
result 9:2, 10:15,	routine 50:17, 63:13	seeks 41:23, 45:7,
39:10, 51:19,	RSA 8:15, 8:22,	48:4, 50:8, 58:6,
53:3, 57:15	8:25, 9:2, 23:21,	58:16 , 78:6
resulted 18:3	23:25, 25:9	seems 12:12, 55:23
results 39:1	rubrics 51:11	seen 11:24, 70:16,
retain 49:19, 54:8	Rule 36:23, 46:21,	73 : 21
retiree 50:13,	49:7, 79:1	send 20:21
69:14, 69:23, 78:8	ruled 34:9	sending 16:23
Retirees 6:3	ruling 36:20, 36:21,	sends 71:21
Retirement 5:19,	44:20, 77:19	senior 9:10
33:15, 33:18,	rulings 40:12	sense 16:16, 24:1,
33:19, 34:7,		65:22
39:22, 40:2, 40:6,		sent 13:3, 18:7,
40:8, 40:10,	< S >	19:3, 19:21,
40:13, 41:3, 41:7,	S. 1:37	19:22, 61:4, 65:6,
41:21, 50:24	S/ 84:12	65:11
retransmission 4:20	safe 83:13	separate 35:4, 35:5,
return 11:3	salaries 78:9	60:6, 70:19
revenues 29:7	sale 39:10	September 5:15,
review 69:24, 69:25,	San 4:1, 4:7, 83:5,	40:13, 42:22
73:3, 80:22, 82:9	83:7	Service 6:4
reviewed 32:6,	sanctions 4:25	services 14:16
39:20, 44:10, 78:4	Sanz 40:20	sessions 6:14
reviewing 23:21	sat 30:13	set 17:3, 17:22,
revised 7:21, 8:13,	satisfaction 43:7	18:5, 31:17, 43:2,
53:18, 55:20,	satisfactory 32:7	48:20, 54:10,
66:9, 82:13	satisfied 41:22,	54:12, 61:9
rights 40:10, 53:25,	41:24, 42:14,	settled 35:3, 45:22
54:8, 54:9, 82:6	63:14, 80:21	Settlement 15:7,

15:11, 15:14,	small 71:19	79:6, 79:13,
15:21, 45:19,	smaller 13:18	79:15, 79:20,
46:9, 48:17,	solution 25:25, 26:1	80:17
48:18, 48:21	solve 30:13	stated 23:4, 27:17,
settles 46:10	somebody 22:10	39:4, 41:1, 55:14,
seven 79:18	someone 52:7, 52:14,	76:24
severable 57:23	67:5	Statement 5:17,
several 11:1, 26:16,	sometimes 30:11,	5:20, 17:25
42:17, 59:22	56:6	statements 27:2
severing 79:20	soon 8:14, 20:12	States 1:1, 1:29,
Shaking 77:16	Sorry 18:18, 22:1,	42:18, 46:5,
shall 15:9	47:21, 54:15,	50:22, 61:19,
shape 27:4	76:15	78:24, 79:4, 84:7
share 25:18, 66:2	sort 15:7, 17:6,	stating 37:1, 51:13
shareholder 35:22,	52:25, 62:10,	status 5:14, 7:15,
38:6	65:13, 75:12	9:5, 11:13, 26:14,
shareholders 35:25	sorts 11:24, 69:25	36:16, 64:3,
shares 39:23, 40:1,	sought 17:13, 17:16,	64:10, 64:19
40:2	45:16, 45:23, 58:2	Stay 6:16, 9:19,
shocks 76:9	sounds 33:3, 68:25	63:6, 71:16, 83:4
shopping 79:23	source 4:13, 74:21	steadfastly 22:2
short 74:8, 74:22	Southern 59:24	steam 23:16, 24:3
shouldn't 19:5,	specific 17:15,	stenography 2:48
35:10	18:12	step 75:20, 81:8
show 37:6, 40:22	specifically 18:11,	stepping 27:6
showing 37:7	48:18, 53:23,	steps 32:11
shown 37:11	71:10, 75:12	stop 25:24
shows 30:25, 31:1	speedy 53:7, 58:4	stopping 25:14
sick 70:13, 70:17	spend 20:22	strategies 28:18
side 77:16	spending 24:16	streamline 29:21,
side-by-side 13:21	staff 15:17, 83:8,	50:9
side. 77:16	83:9	strict 28:13
sides 25:19	staffed 62:25	strictly 29:13
sign 25:9		strong 31:12
J	stage 33:21, 61:17,	
signals 4:18	63:18	structurally 15:16
signed 23:24	stages 82:10	structure 12:25
significant 6:2	stakeholder 5:25,	stuck 15:3, 62:10
significantly 29:8	6:2	style 21:25, 31:9
similarly 80:18	stand 12:21	subject 4:25, 11:12,
simply 32:19, 46:5,	standing 34:25,	15:1, 16:18,
51:12, 52:10	36:4, 36:6, 37:1,	43:12, 44:14,
Sir 46:24, 76:15	37:4, 37:15,	44:22, 51:5,
sit 62:19	38:10, 39:2,	53:21, 54:13,
site 31:10	40:14, 46:2,	54:16, 55:5,
sitting 13:7, 16:21	46:13, 47:7, 60:20	55:15, 56:18,
situation 16:2, 62:4	stands 34:22	59:19, 59:23,
six 68:2, 79:17	start 33:1, 62:9	63:8, 63:19,
slow 10:5, 10:12,	State 42:16, 53:9,	63:21, 73:19,
10:13, 38:22	57:18, 57:20,	78:19, 80:19
slowly 10:18	57:22, 57:23,	submission 33:13,
-	i '	I '

44:17, 49:8, 69:13 submissions 46:22 submit 29:5, 30:20, 41:4, 43:24, 55:20 submitted 13:4, 39:20, 40:21, 53:19 submitting 33:17 subsequent 53:18	Supreme 59:21, 70:5 suspected 19:9 suspicions 27:2 sustain 49:1 sustainability 11:3, 25:2 sustainable 7:7, 25:16 sustained 40:2,	tested 81:1 testified 7:5, 9:14, 30:2 testimony 29:24, 30:8 texting 4:23 themselves 19:2, 62:16, 65:15, 66:15
subsequently 33:22 substance 79:18 substantial 31:10, 65:19, 80:15 substantially 62:6 substantiate 19:7	40:17, 44:15, 46:15, 47:4, 49:10 sustaining 32:21, 41:5, 41:6, 44:19, 47:18, 49:24 SUT 31:14, 31:15	there'll 20:6 thereof 78:5 thereto 33:24, 69:15 they'll 51:25 they've 64:2 thinking 19:13, 68:9
substantiate 13.7 substantively 46:4 succeed 40:10 successes 30:6 successful 14:21, 14:24, 31:21	Swain 1:28, 5:9, 84:7 System 5:20, 15:13, 24:25, 25:7, 25:20, 26:17,	thoroughly 80:5 though 38:2, 38:20, 51:6, 67:8 thousand 18:7, 19:4 thousands 13:20,
successor 69:14 suffered 36:17, 39:10 sufficient 62:25 sufficiently 8:2,	30:5, 31:14, 41:21, 59:20, 68:11, 78:12 systems 6:22, 18:14	51:5, 53:5, 55:25, 57:10 three 6:1, 41:18, 45:9, 48:6, 55:19, 62:19, 68:2, 79:14
16:17, 62:25 suggest 16:2, 32:17, 32:23 suggested 14:4, 21:25, 22:1	< T > takings 71:5 targeted 15:6, 59:2 Tax 11:10, 50:12,	throughout 29:16, 67:18, 68:19 throw 25:13 tie 25:22, 25:23 timely 58:9, 62:15
suggestion 23:8 suggests 48:22 summaries 69:22 summarize 73:18 summary 53:16, 73:2,	57:7, 59:25, 61:24, 62:7, 70:4, 74:20, 74:23, 78:8, 78:16 Taylor 1:28, 84:7	timetable 12:22, 53:20, 53:24 timetables 63:1, 66:6 timing 5:4, 12:11,
81:17, 82:10 summer 65:8 summit 28:11 superb 83:11 superseded 33:22,	Teachers 76:18 team 6:12, 6:15, 9:15 technical 71:19 telephonic 4:8	20:8, 70:16, 71:24, 73:5, 73:11 Title 1:8, 5:24, 8:15, 9:3, 9:20, 9:22, 11:2, 26:19,
35:11 supplemental 40:5 Support 6:10, 7:11, 8:20, 11:7, 11:8, 24:8, 34:23, 78:22, 83:11	tells 72:25 ten 61:18, 63:15, 71:25, 79:21 tens 13:19, 53:5 termination 82:1 terms 7:6, 11:9,	39:24, 49:20, 50:15, 51:8, 57:24, 58:8, 61:22, 63:20, 71:6, 78:24, 79:3, 79:8, 79:17,
supporting 17:7, 17:8, 17:12 supports 58:3 supposed 25:2, 73:7	18:6, 19:11, 23:21, 29:13, 56:10 Terrific 64:22	80:16, 81:2 titled 49:21 Today 5:4, 13:19, 32:14, 34:9,

36:19, 37:3,	turned 4:15, 4:18	undo 74:10
39:22, 45:25,	two 10:13, 20:19,	unfold 26:21
60:20, 66:2,	28:16, 33:1, 35:4,	Unfortunately 14:6,
80:23, 82:20,	35:5, 37:24,	18:23, 40:4
	38:20, 61:20,	
82:22, 82:25,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	UNIDENTIFIED 47:1
83:10	62:19, 63:4, 68:2,	uniform 29:1
together 9:17,	71:20, 79:12,	Union 6:4, 71:4,
16:23, 27:1, 62:13	82:14	78:10
tons 24:16	two-thirds 8:21	unionized 56:4
took 62:13	type 8:7, 20:5,	United 1:1, 1:29,
topic 5:13, 7:14,	34:16, 56:12,	78:24, 79:4, 84:6
23:11	71:24	universe 13:18, 59:2
total 42:11, 43:1	types 50:20, 51:14,	unless 4:16, 6:17
totaling 42:25	55:19, 56:8, 57:7,	unnecessary 16:13
totally 13:16, 23:11	59:12, 60:18,	unprecedented 12:18
towards 27:4	61:15, 65:20,	unresolved 61:20,
traffic 65:20	71:10, 75:21,	81:22
tragedies 10:14	78:7, 81:9	Unsecured 2:5, 14:3
_	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	unsettled 79:14
trailing 68:13	typically 67:20	
trained 15:24		until 6:16, 24:4,
Transcript 2:48,		25 : 17
84:4	< U >	unusual 10:15
transcription 84:5	U-n-a-n-u-e 80:2	update 26:14
transfer 29:20	UCC 58:2, 58:3,	updating 64:17
transferred 58:8	58:6, 58:18	Urban 10:9
transformation 6:19,	ultimate 15:19,	using 4:16, 7:25,
6:23, 26:17,	25:11	31:13, 44:5,
·		
26:22, 27:5, 27:7	ultimately 8:7,	50:10, 53:8,
transition 27:7	13:24, 19:11,	56:21, 58:5
transmission 6:22	29:16	utilization 10:3
transparency 31:7,	Unanue-casal 80:1	
68:19, 68:21, 73:6	uncontested 32:18	
transparent 64:15,	undercuts 58:10	< V >
73:13	undergoing 56:18	vacation 70:13,
travels 83:13	underlying 8:25	70:17
treated 55:18	undermine 11:2	valid 40:7
treatment 11:9,	understand 8:24,	validity 80:9
55:5, 55:15, 77:2	9:25, 12:17,	value 71:4
trial 79:24	15:18, 18:3, 18:9,	variations 21:1
triggers 76:6	21:10, 22:13,	varies 68:4
true 84:5	52:16, 56:6,	various 28:2, 28:12,
Trustee 1:40, 2:22	66:13, 70:10	30:22
try 14:3, 23:7,	understanding 12:2,	vary 67:21, 73:12
76:11	55:9, 55:11, 56:1,	Vazquez 27:8, 27:17,
trying 12:12, 12:18,	62:6, 66:21, 76:4	28:7, 28:11,
14:18, 16:8,	understood 20:20,	28:15, 30:3, 30:12
17:24, 26:2,	36:13, 74:9	venue 69:24
29:15, 30:15,	undertake 16:5,	versus 67:6
59:1, 65:22	16:12	VI 8:15, 9:3, 9:22
turn 45:12, 48:9	underutilized 10:2	vibration 4:18
	l l	

video 83:5, 83:7 view 22:5, 22:16,	76:23, 81:3 window 12:15, 81:14	writ 17:14, 54:25 writing 51:15
26:24, 76:2 viewed 74:21 views 11:5	WISCOVITCH 2:22, 33:15, 33:19, 34:5, 34:6, 34:19,	written 30:8, 38:3, 52:15
visibility 28:10 volume 15:19, 65:19, 66:3	35:24, 36:4, 36:11, 36:14, 36:18, 36:23,	< Y > year 9:4, 28:11,
voluntary 9:1	38:13, 38:21, 39:21, 41:3, 41:6,	50:21 years 10:13, 52:22,
< W > wages 70:13	41:11, 41:12 Wiscovitch-rentas 34:3	52:24, 59:19, 60:3, 61:20, 62:19, 63:4, 68:2
Walker 84:12, 84:13 wanted 31:4, 36:12, 37:19, 55:16, 77:2	wish 53:6, 77:13, 77:14 wishes 5:7, 32:25,	Yesterday 14:14, 23:22, 24:12, 31:5, 32:20
wanting 24:23 wants 68:22, 82:24	41:14, 44:7, 46:18 wishing 49:4	York 1:38, 2:12, 4:7, 7:17, 11:18,
warm 5:3 warrant 22:15 wavelength 74:16	within 71:13, 73:5, 73:7, 78:11, 81:19, 81:25	24:12, 26:6, 59:24, 83:5, 83:7, 83:9
ways 71:20 website 28:1 weed 22:14	withstanding 43:15, 46:16, 49:2 WITNESSES 3:3	
week 13:11, 20:11, 28:15	words 81:10 work 22:4, 23:6,	
weeks 82:14 weigh 56:24, 80:6 welcome 4:5, 5:3	28:23, 30:15, 57:9, 58:15, 66:4, 76:2, 76:5, 82:18,	
welcoming 75:4 well-trained 57:10 whatever 40:11,	82:19, 82:20, 83:9 worked 7:20, 52:22, 52:24, 65:24,	
64:17, 67:11, 67:12, 70:25, 73:22, 73:24, 76:9	66:13 Workers 59:6, 60:16, 60:24, 61:10,	
Whereas 70:4 whether 12:21,	61:11 working 6:18, 8:23,	
12:22, 15:14, 15:16, 16:8, 17:16, 17:20,	9:17, 9:23, 9:25, 16:22, 17:10, 17:18, 27:11,	
24:8, 24:12, 37:14, 52:16, 61:13, 68:14,	28:8, 30:2, 30:14, 60:12, 62:12, 63:3, 68:15, 72:9,	
79:10, 81:11 whichever 36:24, 51:4	75:1 workman 61:2 works 25:13, 33:6	
whole 22:7, 36:1, 73:24, 75:19,	worry 55:8 worth 60:3	
75:24, 81:7 willing 38:17,	wrap 56:16 wrench 25:13	